The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1931 No. 3466

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 625
EDITORIALS:
Congress and Country Leaderless 628
A Great Message 629
The Diehards and India 629
Bad Seasons and Good Plays 630
IF I WERE DICTATOR. By Lewis Mumford 631
RUSSIA AND JAPAN IN MANCHURIA. By Louis Fischer 633
CONGRESS MEETS AT LAST. By Robert S. Allen 635
ENGLAND ON THE EDGE OF CHAOS. By J. A. Hobson 637
THE FEDERAL FARM-RELIEF SCANDAL II. By Mauritz A. Hallgren 641
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 643
CORRESPONDENCE 644
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 644
FINANCE: GERMANY'S CREDITORS CONFER. By S. Palmer Harman 645
BOOKS, DRAMA, FILMS:
The Pressure. By Mark Van Doren 646
Science and Poetry. By Henry Hazlitt 646
Both Photographic and Art. By Johan J. Smertenko 647
Hoover's Missing Years. By Maxwell S. Stewart 648
Books in Brief 649
Drama: Sham Battle of the Sexes. By Joseph Wood Krutch 650
Films: Beginnings. By Margaret Marshall 652

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

DOROTHY VAN DOREN MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

DEVERE ALLEN

Dramatic Editor JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Literary Editor HENRY HAZLITT

Contributing Editors

HEYWOOD BROUN FREDA KIRCHWEY MARK VAN DOREN

LEWIS S. GANNETT H. L. MENCKEN CARL VAN DOREN

JOHN A. HOBSON NORMAN THOMAS ARTHUR WARNER

DAVID BOEHM, Advertising Manager

Subscription Rates: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $6.50; and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City, Cable Address: Nation, New York. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising, Miss Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London W. C. 1, England.

DISGRACEFUL as were the breaking up of the unofficial peace meeting at the Trocadero in Paris on November 27 and the hooting down of such distinguished men as Viscount Cecil, Signor Scialoja, the German delegates, and especially Alanson B. Houghton, who was not allowed to read a word of his speech, they were less significant than the unanimous condonation of this public rowdyism and bad manners by the French press, the legal and police authorities, and the government. We are on the whole not sorry that this outrage took place. It will make plain to intelligent men everywhere that it is France that blocks the way both to peace and to economic sanity in the world; we see clearly the lengths to which its officialdom is willing to go even to stop criticism of its policies. It will further open the eyes of Americans to the present French determination to rule Europe by force, to cling to a military dictatorship far more dangerous than any of the ambitions attributed in war time to the German militarists. However, it should not in the least disturb the President and Secretary Stimson but should make them more than ever determined to isolate France at the Geneva disarmament conference, to create a bloc headed by England and the United States, and to lead the way to disarmament, whether France wishes to come along or not.

HOW CAN PRESIDENT HOOVER expect to arouse enthusiastic support for his disarmament proposal when he is not loyally upheld by his own Secretary of the Navy? This question inevitably arises again as one reads Mr. Adams's annual report, which is an appeal for more funds for the fleet. He declares, among other things, that "many of the most experienced and far-seeing officers feel that amounts reasonably in excess of those being annually appropriated can be used advantageously—in fact are essential to provide adequately for the navy's minimum treaty requirements. . . ." This is backing up your chief with a vengeance. Does not the innocent Mr. Adams know that there has never been a time when "the most experienced and far-seeing officers" did not feel that amounts reasonably, or unreasonably, in excess of the annual appropriations were needed? Mr. Adams's report should have been a whole-hearted support of Mr. Hoover's disarmament plans, should have urged a further decrease of the American naval burdens, and should have pledged his heartiest cooperation to bring about international disarmament at Geneva. As it is we do not see why Secretary Adams does not resign or why Mr. Hoover does not ask his resignation.

WE HAVE REPEATEDLY expressed our belief that great savings could be made in the army if a commission of business men were given the power to reorganize it, eliminate the unnecessary officers and men, and introduce business methods throughout. In the annual report of Major General H. A. Drum, Inspector General of the army, we find striking confirmation of our contention. The Inspector General calls for the redistribution of the regular army, not primarily for the purpose of saving money, it is true, but from the point of view of adequately training the combat forces. He points out that the infantry troops available for immediate field service are distributed among twenty-four regiments located at no less than forty-five different posts with only a battalion or less than a battalion at thirty-four of these posts. Artillery troops, he says, "are in a similar situation. They are distributed among seven regiments and seven different battalions located at nineteen different posts with a battalion or less at sixteen." There is no sound military reason whatsoever for manning all these posts. Most of them would be of little value in war time; they are usually maintained to satisfy local politicians or local pride, and their abolition would make great savings.

THE LONGER SIGNOR GRANDI stayed here, the better we liked him and his utterances. We know very well that many have read and heard him with profound distrust, doubting the sincerity of his demand for disarmament in view of the fact that Italy is annually spending 25.1 per cent of its budget for army and navy, and that hardly more than a year ago Mussolini was making saber-rattling speeches in the worst manner of the ex-Kaiser. None the less, whatever the present Italian motive, Signor Grandi's speeches were exactly like those that Mr. Hoover ought to be making about the coming disarmament conference, and every foreign

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minister as well; moreover, he has behind him as evidence of his sincerity the fact that he proposed, and put through, the truce of one year in all new shipbuilding which is now in force. He was extraordinarily outspoken and frank, his whole thesis admirable. One phrase that he coined should be framed and displayed in every Foreign Office: "We must fortify justice and not justify force." In his final speech he went farther than previously in that he declared that Italy considers the reduction of armaments a moral as well as a juridical obligation on all governments and made the extremely important statement that Italy "cannot share the view that an absolute security is the condition *sine qua non* for starting any measure of disarmament"—Paris please take notice. It is a pity that his visit was marred by the two-year sentence given to a young anti-Fascist for jumping on the running board of Grandi's motor car in Philadelphia and shouting "Down with fascism." For this episode Grandi made the grateful gesture of urging clemency.

WE ARE NOT SURPRISED by the news that Senators James G. Davis of Pennsylvania and James T. Watson of Indiana were allowed, by means of notes, to purchase stock in two sugar companies directed by one B. G. Dahlberg. Senator Watson's interesting alibi is: "The stock is of no account, and worth nothing, and neither is my note. Therefore the score is 0 to 0 in this game. This was a purely private business transaction, with no relation to legislation past, present, or future." Senator Davis, our noble ex-Secretary of Labor, admits that he made a little profit; but, like the servant girl's baby, it was "such a little one" that he gave it to charity. From neither of these men did we expect any appreciation of the morality of this transaction. Mr. Davis's unblushing solicitation, often written on official stationery, of funds for Mooseheart while he was in the Cabinet, showed clearly enough that he was totally lacking in understanding of the decencies of office. Both Senators were high lights in their party in 1928 when the Dahlberg transaction took place. Both were facing the fact of a tariff revision, yet they had no compunctions whatever at being "carried" by a promoter who was lobbying furiously for higher tariff rates. Incidentally, Mr. Dahlberg was so skilful a promoter that he succeeded in getting our good friend Herbert Hoover to visit the plant of one of his companies. Dispatches report that the testimony was "very amusing" so far as the details of the President-elect's visit are concerned.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE has suddenly discovered, after weeks of investigation by numerous secret-service agents, that the "hunger march" on Washington is being directed by a group of Communists. The department's announcement, which reads as though it were deliberately designed to alarm the country, suggests that the "hunger march" is a deep and mysterious bolshevik plot. Sections of the announcement go so far as to hint that the unemployed taking part in the march intend to fight their way to Washington. One sentence, for example, reads: "It is reported that the delegates and marchers will travel on trucks and all will be furnished with rifles. This, of course, we believe far-fetched, and simply report it for what it may be worth, if anything." If the agents believed this rumor far-fetched, why did they report it unless they meant to use it in stirring up general hostility? Moreover, why was an investigation necessary in the first place, and why were the results of that investigation announced in such a sensational manner? The secret-service agents could have learned as much as they did by reading recent files of the various Communist publications. There has been little effort to make a mystery or conspiracy of the proposed "hunger march." Has the Department of Justice a specific purpose in mind in attempting to sensationalize the Communist demonstration? Does it mean that Washington this winter intends to follow a policy of labeling as bolshevik everyone who advocates direct government relief for the unemployed?

DISREGARDING what one may call the minor scandals involved in the administration of the Federal Farm Board, and even accepting on their face the figures of Chairman Stone, the main fact which stands out is that at the market levels of October 31, which were higher than present levels, the board has lost $102,000,000 in wheat and $75,000,000 in cotton. This $177,000,000, moreover, was worse than thrown away. When the 190,000,000 bushels of wheat and the 1,311,000 bales of cotton that the board now holds have finally been sold, even the farmers in whose supposed interests the board's activities were undertaken will have suffered more than they have benefited. As the United States raises only about one-quarter of the world's wheat crop, any purchases in the open market, so long as we remain a wheat-exporting nation, must raise not merely the American price of wheat, but the world price. But this world aid at the expense of the American taxpayer is only a temporary one. The wheat held, no matter how long it overhangs the market, meanwhile exercising a depressing psychological influence, must be sold again, and prices must be depressed by as much as they had previously been raised. The board bought high and found itself obliged to sell low. It thereby increased the violence of the price change and encouraged the farmer to maintain acreage when he ought to have been reducing it. The Farm Board fiasco has the dubious distinction of being complete and perfect.

JAPAN MAY CONSIDER itself strong enough to defy the League of Nations and to ignore the counsel of the American State Department, but it has met a formidable foe in the Chinese people. Their boycott of Japanese goods is now making itself felt in Tokio, Osaka, and other commercial centers, and this may, if continued much longer, have the effect of reducing Japanese military pressure in Manchuria. A Department of Commerce bulletin says that as a result of the boycott Japanese shipping "is suffering additional depression." Ships to the number of 534 are lying idle in Japanese harbors. But the most disastrous result is shown in the cotton-textile exports to China. In October of last year 46,000,000 square yards of cotton cloth were sold to the Chinese; in October of this year less than 400,000 square yards were exported to that country. In another direction an equally intangible force has been set in motion with a view to checking Japanese imperialism in Manchuria. Forty-one national and international peace organizations have petitioned President Hoover requesting him to take more vigorous action in support of efforts now being made to stop the Sino-Japanese conflict. They have urged him "to publish all correspondence with Japan and China relating thereto."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SECRETARY STIMSON should know by now how dangerous secret diplomacy can be. The tendency of the State Department to clothe with secrecy all its moves in the Manchurian controversy was largely, if not wholly, responsible for the misunderstanding in Japan over Mr. Stimson's remarks concerning Japanese military movements in Manchuria. The bitter resentment of the Japanese press and Foreign Office for the statement erroneously attributed to Secretary Stimson could have had very serious consequences. Fortunately, both Tokio and Washington realized the delicacy of the incident created by the misunderstanding in time to prevent the Sino-Japanese conflict from becoming a row between the United States and Japan. Mr. Stimson was in a position to bring about a quick and satisfactory adjustment because he had unquestionably been misquoted. But it seems clear from the facts developed in connection with the misunderstanding that not only are the League Council and the American people being kept in doubt as to the State Department's attitude, but that Tokio, with whom there has been a constant exchange of secret correspondence, does not feel certain where Washington stands.

THE SENTENCING of Carl von Ossietsky, the distinguished editor of *Die Weltbühne,* to one and one-half years in prison because of an article revealing secrets of the German air force, which he published no less than two and one-half years ago, shows how little freedom of the press has come to mean under the German republic. It is the more striking because the conviction is under an old law enacted under the Kaiser just before the beginning of the World War. Granted that Von Ossietsky was indiscreet in publishing this article, it is certainly not an offense to call for so ferocious a sentence so long after the deed. Probably it represents a good deal of the pent-up anger against Von Ossietsky because of his constant criticism of the existing government. As the Berlin *Tageblatt* has pointed out, nothing could be worse at this time than this sentence. With the disarmament conference meeting at Geneva in two months what could be better calculated to increase French fear that Germany is secretly armed or in possession of military secrets of so grave a nature as to warrant such a punishment? As a matter of fact, Germany in its present situation ought to have no military secrets whatsoever that it cannot give to the world. The conviction of Von Ossietsky is a blow at the liberty of the press everywhere.

THE MEXICAN PRESS is highly and rightfully indignant over the acquittal of two Oklahoma deputy sheriffs in connection with the shooting to death of Emilio Cortes Rubio and Manuel Garcia Gomez, Mexican students. "Innocence in Oklahoma," as *Universal* of Mexico City comments, "is hard to understand." The students, one a cousin of President Rubio of Mexico, were killed while driving through Oklahoma on their way home to spend the summer vacation with their families. The deputies suspected them of having liquor in their car. A misunderstanding and the shooting followed. Fortunately, the Mexican government has refused to become unduly excited over the acquittal of the two officers, and even the Mexican public, although outspoken in its condemnation of the verdict, has raised no demand for vengeance. It would hardly be possible to imagine the American public taking such a serene view of the situation had two American students of good family met death under similar circumstances in Mexico. The Mexican government has indicated that it will ask damages for the killing of Rubio and Gomez. Governor William H. Murray of Oklahoma has said that he will request the State legislature to pay $5,000 each to the families of the students. Surely Oklahoma could do not less.

TWENTY-SEVEN DEATHS—that is the toll taken by football this fall. "While the total is alarming," writes the New York *Evening Post,* "it is found that only five of the players killed this year were members of college squads." Pray what has that to do with it? The life of a high-school player is as valuable as that of a collegian; the death of one as profoundly tragic as that of the other; the family's grief and misery as acute in one case as the other. This figure does not include those hopelessly crippled, the many who are injured; one of the Fordham University players is coming back to "activity" in a paralyzed condition which may not yield while life lasts. Why should these casualties be tolerated? We do not deny that football has merits; that it is a challenging spectacle. But the game could be altered at the next session of those who yearly meet to revise the rules if they only desired to do so, and in such a way as not to deprive the game of its interest and thrill. If the president of Yale, within whose Bowl a West Point cadet was fatally injured this year, and two other heads of great universities would demand such changes as would minimize the risks, we believe the reforms would be made. It is true that the slaughter is not so serious as that during the hunting season—incomplete figures show 20 killed and 101 wounded in New York State alone in the pursuit of this sport; none the less the game of football can and should be reformed or else abolished.

BALLYHOO, the latest entrant to the lists of humorous magazines, now sells more than 2,000,000 copies an issue and that sale is steadily increasing. Though the paper has been appearing only for a few months, an enterprising publisher has already brought out "The Book of Ballyhoo" made up of selections from it. *Ballyhoo* is not, with due apologies to the editors and with due recognition of the mustachios and leg-o'-mutton sleeves in its illustrations, incomparably funny; it depends for much of its humor on fairly broad improprieties, but so do a number of other magazines that do not command such magnificent sales; it is vaguely patterned after the *New Yorker,* but that wholly admirable journal has never reached such a circulation as does the newcomer. One can only conclude that the public, while it succumbs to advertising ballyhoo to such a large extent as evidently to justify the enormous expenditures of hard-headed advertisers, nevertheless likes to see fun poked at one of its own weaknesses. It will buy in huge quantities the cigarettes which kind-hearted movie actresses received "not one cent" to indorse; but when *Ballyhoo* paraphrases thus: "Not one cent was paid for Miss Zilch's statement. Of course Miss Zilch's new picture is about to be released, and two million dollars' worth of publicity isn't to be sneezed at, but why bring that up?" it can see the point and enjoy a guffaw thereat. We like to be fooled; we like to laugh at ourselves for being fooled. If this is the great human secret which *Ballyhoo* has discovered, it deserves a vote of thanks from a grateful public.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress and Country Leaderless

IN a grave hour, indeed, the Seventy-second Congress meets—in a vacuum so far as ideas and programs are concerned. To us this seems more menacing than the country's desperate economic plight. For there are remedies which the statesmen may still turn to when the hour becomes grave enough, yet there is no program and no policy advanced on any hand. How to conjure up quickly leaders and a political machinery in this emergency to follow the dictates of common sense, free from partisanship and the selfishness of privilege, we know not. Never since Buchanan has the country been so badly served—we are not sure that we are wholly just to Buchanan. It is true that President Hoover has done some good things, usually too late, sometimes in such a way as to nullify their best results, and often under severe pressure. Occasionally, as in the matter of his rescuing the banks, his action has been clear-cut and successful, but we defy anyone to say that as a whole his leadership has been else than tortuous, misleading, mistaken, and confusing. The result is that he has lost the confidence and the interest of the people; not long ago his counterfeit presentment, thrown upon the screen in his own town of Pasadena, was booed and hissed by the spectators.

But we have no time to rehearse anew the injury Mr. Hoover has done by his false philosophy in dealing with the crisis, his minimizing, his deprecating, his unfounded assertions that prosperity was, or is, in the offing. The fact is that the situation of the country is much worse than it has been, and that if Mr. Hoover tells the whole truth when he performs his constitutional duty of reporting the state of the Union to the new Congress, he will say so. But formulate a far-reaching and drastic program he will not, because he cannot. His old philosophy of running the country by, for, and with the great business interests has utterly broken down, for the leadership of business has failed as much as that of politics. The system cracks before our eyes, but Mr. Hoover seeks only to put on one patch after another, to meet one emergency after the other when it is no longer possible to avoid action. He is now yielding to the inevitable of increased taxation after violently opposing it, precisely as he will yield to the advocates of a great bond issue for public works and, if the depression grows worse and lasts another year, to those who demand direct federal aid for the unemployed. In every aspect of our affairs, notably in matters international, he vacillates, fumbles, is confused, and confuses. Of a real program of economic reform there is not a sign.

As for the new Congress, it too meets without either of the parties having anything to offer. The Republican leaders go hat in hand to the President they dislike or despise, and then announce the latest policy as they emerge from the White House. They themselves have nothing to give Mr. Hoover in the way of carefully thought-out recommendations. The leaders do not even come together formally to counsel in this emergency. As to their rivals—there is no opposition. The Democrats are more helpless and hopeless than the Republicans. For months it has been plain that in the new Congress they would have an amazing chance for leadership, for winning the country on the eve of the Presidential election by demonstrating their statesmanship, and the leadership for which it longs, of which it is in such dire need. It is a chance that rarely comes to men in high position to win the regard and gratitude of their countrymen. Have the Democrats done anything to plan their winter's work, to take the leading part in the sanitation and the safeguarding of the country in the field of economics and finance? Nothing. As Robert Allen points out elsewhere in this issue, they are rudderless. Instead of sitting for weeks in most earnest counsel and formulating a constructive program, they come together with empty hands, waiting to see what Mr. Hoover is going to say. After that they will shape their own program on the spur of the moment, in order to get as much political profit out of it as they possibly can. Beyond that nothing. Nor are the Congressional leaders alone guilty. The leading Democratic candidate for the Presidential nomination refuses to say where he stands today on prohibition, on the tariff, on unemployment, on debts and reparations. On none of the burning issues has Governor Roosevelt expressed himself.

Now we are not asking the impossible of these men. We are not demanding super-statesmanship of them. We merely demand leadership. We are, of course, not suggesting that they should work out a national plan such as it has suddenly become the fashion to advocate. But it is certainly not asking too much of a great political party, which offers itself to take the place of the men who have failed so totally, that it state its position and what it will do in regard to agricultural relief, unemployment, the moratorium, debts, reparations, disarmament, the World Court, the tariffs. They are so shot to pieces, so destitute of intellectual leaders, so divided in their own counsels that they offer no alternative whatever. This is what is so discouraging and so menacing. We have a two-party system of government which presupposes a perpetual alternative choice for the American electorate. Today the only hope or leadership in Congress comes from a handful of Progressives. Occasionally a man like Senator Johnson speaks out as he did last week in demanding that Mr. Hoover give up his candidacy for renomination, but even the Progressives are divided among themselves in what is a national emergency, if there ever was one.

All of which provides a melancholy spectacle in a country which has boasted of its superiority to all the rest of the world, and declared that it alone had the secret of prosperity and public well-being. We can only once more point out the utter futility of expecting anything from either side, and urging anew the building of a party of ideas, principles, and courage that will show at least a readiness to offer a few of the reforms that are absolutely essential. We are more than ever convinced that given a single leader of courage, conviction, and liberalism, it would still be possible to create a genuine opposition in time for next fall's election. Otherwise we must continue to wallow in the slough of despond; remain caught in one of the severest blows in our history, and without even the courage to reef down, make all secure, and steer a new course.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Great Message

IN the concluding paragraphs of his recent message to the special session of the Wisconsin legislature—a message truly remarkable in more ways than one—Governor Philip La Follette wrote:

> I am fully aware that the program we have heretofore adopted and that is herein recommended challenges the monopoly system at its foundation. I know the power of that system. I know what it can do to the public and even private lives of men that challenge it. I know the attacks, subtle, open, and under-cover, to which every one of you will be subjected.
>
> You will be assailed. You will be called bolshevists and anarchists and any other names that come into the mind of the hired men of the system. They will say that you are destructive, although they offer no alternatives themselves. *They will tell you that the government cannot put* 5,000,000 *men to work, although they forget that they put* 4,000,000 *American young men to work at the business of war; that they squandered* $40,000,000,000 *of American money in the most wasteful and futile war of modern history.* And still they will say that you are extravagant and wasteful and visionary because you propose to spend millions or billions to build highways and bridges and power plants that will make the farmer's and the worker's life better and happier; you may spend tens of millions to destroy—but nothing to build a richer and finer life.

This is not only a challenge to the monopoly system. It is a challenge to every man and woman in public office, to the leaders in American industry and finance, to the American people themselves. It is a challenge that must be met, and met with enduring success.

Philip La Follette himself is anything but a bolshevist or anarchist. Every line of his message shows that. He wants to see an orderly democratic society sustaining itself. He would keep what is best of our older institutions. But he would cut out cleanly and forever the various malignant growths that have taken root in those institutions. His message is a severe indictment of monopoly, special privilege, and the present inequitable distribution of wealth. It bitterly criticizes the general run of our industrialists and financiers for their lack of leadership in the economic crisis, though it does not overlook the fact that a few of these men, all too few in Governor La Follette's and our own opinion, have had the courage to face our economic and social problems realistically, and to propose remedies. The message, however, is more than mere criticism. It sets forth a program designed to contribute to the future security of the people of Wisconsin as well as to meet an emergency.

The following four courses "that we may pursue" are suggested by Governor La Follette:

> 1. The direct control and ownership by the people through their municipal, State, and national governments of enough of those instruments of common necessity to protect the public against extortionate charges, to insure efficient service, and, to the extent of the ownership, thus to effect a better distribution of the earning power of those facilities. . . .
>
> 2. The provision of machinery by the State that will enable business—and I use business in its larger sense—to govern itself. . . .
>
> 3. The provision of machinery for undertaking and carrying on the profound research we need as a society; for the taking of economic and social counsel, and the definite attempt to plan continuously both for the present and the future of our communities. . . .
>
> 4. The equalization of the burden of taxation. . . .

These are the principal points of Governor La Follette's general program. A part of the program has already been realized through legislation enacted at the last session of the assembly. The Governor has now asked the special session, by way of furthering the program, and also to meet the economic emergency, to appropriate funds for unemployment relief, lower so far as practical the tax burden on property, authorize a temporary increase in income taxes, and institute certain reforms in the banking system of the State. He would have the unemployment-relief funds used "preferably for the direct labor costs of public works," but also "for poor relief when public works cannot be practically provided." His banking reforms would give the State Banking Department "wider authority over the management of banks and over the individuals who conduct them"—a wise recommendation in the light of recent happenings in that field—and would also seek to prevent gambling in bank stocks.

Summed up, the Governor's message shows not only that courage we have come to expect from members of the La Follette family. It also reveals a knowledge of current affairs and problems such as every public official ought to have. The governors of all the other States would do well to study this important document, but before all, it ought to be thoroughly digested by President Hoover.

The Diehards and India

ONLY a British right-about-face could apparently have rescued the Round Table Conference from the abyss toward which it drifted in its closing weeks. But instead of frank generosity on the part of the British government, which might have stilled the conviction of futility growing in the minds of the Indian delegates, the discussions merely reveal that India's major demands are to be ignored. On November 8 the All-India Congress cabled Mahatma Gandhi its opinion that he ought to come home, though leaving it to him to remain longer if he thought there was anything to gain. Reluctant to depart before exhausting every hope of a settlement, Gandhi stayed on. A week later, when once more the negotiations seemed fruitless, a pledge by the Moslems not to seek the fulfilment of their claims as a prerequisite to a constitution afforded a renewed gleam of hope.

But with every move toward increasing Hindu-Moslem unity, the irrepressible diehard Tories, feeling their oats as a result of the election, made it plain to the Prime Minister that no really liberal policy would be tolerated. Viscount Rothermere in the *Daily Mail* cried out for a summary end to the proceedings, and urged the government to "send Gandhi home." Through the press and on the platform the prefervid Winston Churchill and his coterie of extremists began to wage an intensified campaign. More than once they were accused by Hindu and Labor delegates of making underground approaches to the recalcitrant Moslems in order to protract the latters' insistence over the minority question.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It remained for the Undersecretary for India, the Marquess of Lothian, who is ordinarily a Liberal in international affairs, to stir the ultimate resentment of the entire Indian delegation by recommending strongly in the House of Lords repressive measures to crush "terrorism" in Bengal. Lord Lothian's address was the signal for an outburst of fury by Lord Brentford, in which that famous Labor-baiter placed the blame for the murder of a dozen Englishmen in India on the shoulders of Mahatma Gandhi.

Coming as they did at a most critical juncture in the conference, these incendiary utterances were calculated to give the negotiations their death blow. Even Mahatma Gandhi's critics, if fair, could not fail to recognize his infinite patience. In the face of outpourings by the yellow journals, some of which declared that he would go down in history chiefly as a man who defied London climate with a loin cloth, he has preserved his dignity and friendliness. He has lived up to his ideal of "no hatred for any Englishman," wistfully expressing his desire to talk most of all face to face with his enemies. Though sensible to the pressure of his impatient Congress colleagues and to the need of vigorous action to hold back a violent element in rebel India, he has manifested an increasing restiveness because of the multitudinous delays. Not minimizing the seriousness of the disagreements between the Hindus and the minority elements, he has shared with many observers the conviction that it was part of British strategy to withhold a definite promise of self-government until the breakdown of the discussions among the Indian groups should place upon them the onus for a possible failure of the conference.

It was the final blow to Indian faith when Lord Sankey, for the Federal Structure Committee, brought in a majority report definitely denying to India the right to control her own army and foreign relations, though conceding a substantial measure of fiscal autonomy. To the Indians the army has always been a sore point, and with abundant reason. As long as the army is controlled by Britain, genuine freedom seems to the natives inconceivable. The cost to them has been terrific. British India stands in the seventh place among the nations in military outlay. Every year $205,000,000 goes to maintain an army which is exceedingly unpopular and which drains off more than 62 per cent of the total central expenditure. Not counting Great Britain itself, the cost of defense in British India is more than double that for all of the rest of the Empire together. If it seems inconsistent on the part of the non-violent Gandhi to press for an Indian army, it must be remembered that he puts no trust in the possibility of disarming India so long as the military forces are under the dominance of an outside government. The portent of the Sankey draft convinced the Indian delegates that the government meant to withhold a centralized autonomy, and, instead, grant nothing beyond the type of provincial self-rule envisaged in the repudiated Simon report. Steadfastly they have characterized such a compromise as intolerable.

A new campaign of civil disobedience may soon be under way. It means untold suffering to the Indian masses, for the temper of the Tories is clear to all. For the British workers and business men it spells incalculable economic loss. But it is the one potent weapon available to India, and it will be used, whatever it may cost, until the British people undertake to tame their imperialistic firebrands.

Bad Seasons and Good Plays

NEVER within the memory of man has the theatrical business been what the producers would consent to call good. Every time any play fails, its manager naturally feels that the show business is dying, and since most plays are always failing, the stage is perpetually on its last legs—except, of course, in the opinion of those lucky impresarios who happen to have a hit.

This year, however, things are naturally a good deal worse than usual. The business man whose business is the producing of plays is as badly off as every other business man, and the workers in the theater are at least as likely to be unemployed as the workers in any other field. According to *Variety,* the actors appearing in the vaudeville show at the lyric Theater (just off Broadway) are receiving an average salary of one dollar and ten cents per performance, and the present indications are that Christmas week will see only twenty-five legitimate theaters operating in the Times Square district. When it is remembered that twenty-four were open during the *summer* of 1929, the real extent of the slump becomes apparent and it is no wonder that the Shubert Theater Corporation—by far the largest operating company—has gone into the hands of a receiver.

Fortunately, however, the playgoer is by no means so badly off as the manager. The present autumn has seen rather more good plays than usual offered to the public, and at the present moment there are current at least eleven theatrical entertainments which even a critical spectator is almost certain to enjoy. Neither New York nor any other city usually has more to offer, and though the producers have their worries, the spectator who can choose from among the following may count himself lucky: "Mourning Becomes Electra," "Brief Moment," "The House of Connelly," "Counsellor-at-Law," "Reunion in Vienna," "Cynara," "The Barretts of Wimpole Street," "Grand Hotel," "The Streets of New York," "The Laugh Parade" (Ed Wynn), and "The Band Wagon."

Moreover, it is worth noting that these plays have without exception been making money and that, as a matter of fact, no conspicuously meritorious production has failed this season to do so. Two of the plays listed above are in their second season; the best of them all, "Mourning Becomes Electra," is drawing $25,000 a week and tops the list of legitimate productions.

Perhaps the old platitude which states that it is always a good season for good plays and always a bad season for bad ones is not quite adequate; but from the standpoint of the person who likes to attend the theater twelve or fifteen times a year it is pretty nearly so. Doubtless some plays are not doing so well as they would have done last year; doubtless some which were taken off as failures would have lost less money for their sponsors during a better season; but not one of such was good enough to deserve much lamentation from the members of its potential audience. The only real effect of the season's badness is seen in the death of mediocrities which a more reckless prosperity would have allowed to survive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If I Were Dictator*

By LEWIS MUMFORD

Address to the Action-Units on the First Anniversary of the Dictatorship

COMRADES: We have seized power because those who nominally possessed it had no means of using it, while those who used it put their private advantage above the public good. Our mission will be over when we have contrived new instruments of corporate life in harmony with our social purposes and have reunited power and responsibility. During the generation before we achieved control, political life had almost disappeared: no party dared to take the necessary steps out of the morass of chicane and greed and unimaginative national rapacity. Every political leader felt bound to keep intact the swollen fortunes of the minority, to maintain the irresponsible control of semi-monopolistic industrial groups, to preserve the unstable equilibrium of the inverted financial pyramid, to respect the bellicose demands of a bigoted and uninformed nationalism. We have now overcome this paralysis in our moral and political life; but do not mistake the authority our action-units exercise. They are in the nature of a powerful stimulant, a poison introduced at the moment of crisis in order to restore the normal functions of the body. Even now you are relatively few in number; your influence has been that of organization, self-discipline, rational purpose—a moral influence. Within five years I hope to address only a skeleton army. You will return, disciplined and refreshed, to a country that already shows the happy effect of your exertions. Meanwhile: be watchful.

From a Letter to the President of the Economic Council

During the first stage of the economic transition it has been necessary to assume as fixed the objectives of the past economic order. Your provisional organization has been admirable. By the establishment of a commissary of supplies and shelter in every community, we have been able to guarantee subsistence to every person; by erecting a national minimum, to which all individuals are entitled, irrespective of status, vocational ability, or capacity to work, we have not only laid an indispensable foundation for planned machine production; we have lessened the friction and suffering that would otherwise have been inflicted, not alone upon the uppermost tenth of the income groups, but upon numerous pensioners and supporters of bourgeois society. The socialization of land, capital, and credit have been accomplished all the more effectively because we have taken these measures without vindictiveness; the good surgeon, ruthless with the knife, does not disdain anaesthesia.

But the transformation we seek is something more than a nominal change in power and control; we must resist the strong temptation to buttress the existing economic structure by accepting its objectives and attempting to carry it on. Under the financial canons of the past, the goal of economic production was to create new wants, to expand the market, to provide a constantly increasing turnover of goods, to direct economic activities toward the fields of greatest individual profits. Our new economic system must rest upon two radically different assumptions: first, our prime duty is to supply a constant minimum of the necessaries of life for our whole population: second, we must turn a good part of our excess energies into forms of life which bring no direct and measurable economic return—the bearing and rearing of children, the cultivation of the arts and sciences, the building of new cities and the complete reconstruction of old ones, the magnificent rehabilitation of the whole countryside. Once we have established an adequate minimum for the whole population, our current production must be directed, not toward creating aimless wants and meaningless luxuries, but toward providing replacements. Gains in production, through new inventions, through planning and rationalization, will then provide further energy and man power for creative activity. The success of an economic order must be judged, not by the absolute output of goods, but by the ratio of consumption to creation.

Fortunately, we have already taken a step or two in the right direction. In many communities the proportion of teachers to children has been doubled. Eventually, I suggest, we must quadruple it; this is only a limited first move toward replacing the prison discipline of the old public school with the experimental and many-sided activity necessary for a healthy education. Similarly, we must break up our expanded and overorganized cities, schools, universities into many times the present number of units; in various industries the same requirements hold true for administration and factory organization; we must recover the human scale.

In the organization of production, once the formidable inertia of the past is overcome, the Economic Council will perhaps tend to err on the side of conservatism. I for one would not have it otherwise. Our problem in America, unlike that of our comrades in Soviet Russia, is to reduce the tempo of industrialism. We must turn society from its feverish preoccupation with money-making inventions, goods, profits, salesmanship, symbolic representations of wealth to the deliberate promotion of the more humane functions of life. No Economic Council can by itself enforce such a change; but by providing the proper instruments and organization, by collaborating with those educational and cultural agencies that are working in the same direction, it can guide this change to fruitful issues.

Speech to the League of Youth

YOUNG MEN AND YOUNG WOMEN: I will not burden you with the platitude that the hope of the Green Republic lies with you, nor flatter you with the comforting delusion that your beliefs and prejudices are valid in direct proportion to your inexperience. The great advantage of youth is that it is the period that fosters the maximum contempt for death. To you, then, we have given some of the dangerous tasks of society: those of the mine, the construction camp, the aviation field, the lumber camp, the hospital. Your service

* The fourth of a series of articles on this subject. Others will follow in early issues.—EDITOR THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in industry is part of your social education and personal discipline; your foreign expeditions at the call of the World Economic Council have rounded out that sense of international society which you acquired, in the germ, through your intercourse with visiting teachers of other nationalities in your schools, from the earliest grades onward. Most of you have deeper regional roots than the average American of the past order; but, by the same token, you have lost the stale illusions of isolation and self-sufficiency: you are, in a very real and effective sense, citizens of the world—and this is a higher honor and a greater privilege than that of being the citizen of any single country. What the Green Revolution has given you is not allegiance to a country, but allegiance to a universal corporate idea.

Message to the Lower Lakes Council of Corporations

The Council of Commissars views with concern the effort to form political parties within the local corporations. The net effect of this effort would be to upset the equilibrium of interests and to create false issues; moreover, it is a sign that the local corporations are not performing their functions. The council regards this part of the political structure as of critical importance. Today the citizen does not vote through his political party; he votes through his corporation—through his city, his university, his factory, his consumers' cooperative, his professional association; he has as many votes as he has interests and functions. Should the work of the local units fall off, should place-holders and demagogues take the posts of able administrators who are skilled in composing differences and finding a common workable ground, the efficiency of the Council of Commissars itself would be hampered; power would revert to the Central Authority, where it existed at first at the beginning of the revolution, and I would speedily become a Caesar or fall before some unscrupulous commissar who was bent on becoming a Caesar himself. A government that really operated under the principles of the old political system, and was Socialist one day and Tory the next, or Democrat one year and Republican the next, would be impossible; as a matter of fact, the theory was a deception. Behind the scenes the work of the government went on—almost equally bad or equally good—with little respect for party mandates.

Today our political life must be a constant reality, since it deals with real forces, real issues, real interests; but the essence of our system is that these issues can neither be formulated nor expressed through the medium of the political party. Our system is not to count numerical votes; we compose and integrate corporate pressures. Let me recall a familiar example—the reduction by the Economic Council of the program for industrial expansion during the three-year period beginning last October, in order to lower the general working hours from six to five and a half. That issue might have led to a deadlock between the Council of Cities and Regions and the Economic Council; or, carried on in accordance with the principles of party government, it might have become the issue in a whole series of electoral contests between the ins and the outs. The prompt decision of the Council of Commissars in favor of reduction avoided this futile display of power, and the popular response proved that we interpreted correctly the sentiment of the country. The fear that we should fall below the world quota in the surplus production of wheat, cotton, petroleum, and cotton goods has proved after a year's experiment to be unfounded. The World Economic Council has even suggested a further experimental reduction in export commodities to a five-hour schedule.

Extract from a Radio Broadcast Under the Auspices of the Commissar of Education

Today it is highly important to distinguish between these different methods in education: indoctrination, training, cultivation. Some of our comrades wish to make over the entire educational system on doctrinal lines, they would crystallize the beliefs and slogans of the revolution into a permanent system of habits and attitudes. Nothing could be more fatal to the real accomplishments of the revolution. The method of indoctrination would burden us with stale dogmas and empty shibboleths and keep us from controlling effectively the flux of reality.

But while indoctrination is always a danger, training for the tasks and opportunities of our society is necessary; this concerns itself not with beliefs and attitudes by themselves, but with actions. The old order left us with a vast mass of unsocialized and undisciplined people; some of these were mentally unfit to take part in the new order, others were actively hostile, others still were untrained for any useful work whatever. It is for these adults that we have established our temporary agricultural and industrial training schools; passage through these institutions is necessary as a qualification for leaving the present undesirable quarters once occupied by the rich in our big cities, and obtaining work and residence in the new regional cities we have been creating. This task of rehabilitation will take at least a generation. In cases of extreme moral degeneration, as in many gangsters, business men, politicians, and racketeers, we have sought to use every resource of medicine and psychiatry to further the work.

At last we come to the main task of education: the discipline and cultivation of the whole personality, that continuous process which begins in the cradle and ends only with the grave. What type of personality do we seek to create? We seek to abolish the narrow specialist, the fanatic, the dangerous madman who would simplify life by the elegant methods of Procrustes. We do not deny the values and interests that properly belong to the workaday world; on the contrary, we are steadily reorganizing production so as to assimilate more of them. But the processes of life and culture complement those limited experiences, and the man or woman whose activities have been limited to the narrow walls of the office or the factory, who has been nurtured on "hard facts" alone, who has never found his life heightened and intensified by a painting, a drama, a poem, or an imaginative grasp of the actual by means of philosophy or aesthetics—such a man or woman has not fully entered into his human heritage.

From a Personal Letter, Written Five Years After the Revolution

But surely, my dear E., you see beneath the surface of my "dictatorial mug." A dictator, even such a temporary one as I purpose to be, cannot operate from behind the scenes; he must appear in public, that is, in character. Had I so much as cracked a smile during the first year, our enemies

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have regarded it as a sign of weakness, and so would a sheepish populace. Hence the frown and the implacable jaw—and how my face aches after a long day in public! To speak frankly, this business of make-up is all that I have learned about the political animal during my three years in office; and I learned this during the first week, when I was tempted to jest with a rebellious major general. The soldiers thought I was afraid of him and almost deserted me; I was compelled to have him executed on the spot to prevent a counter-revolution from occurring. After that I scowled at such people—and canceled the death sentence. Aside from this, I have learned nothing about managing the political animal that I did not already know as president of a small college. The main thing is to have a good dean; he must do the dirty work, hire and fire, boss and bully, and execute all the disagreeable orders, in order that the Chief shall not fall into public disfavor. As executive secretary of the council, my old dean at Swarthurst has done admirably; there is nothing like a good grounding in the classics to fit a man for such a post.

We have made our share of mistakes, but I had counted on making more. I had forgotten the positive energy and capacity for growth of the young people who rallied around the original action-units. We shall pass beyond our present catchwords—incorporate, integrate, internationalize—as we have already passed beyond the earlier shibboleths of the revolution—deflate, decentralize, distribute. Some of our engineers, still limited and fundamentally uneducated men, may fancy that the highest mission of an organized society is to make organization universal; but quite the contrary, I feel that the real use of organization is to leave large tracts of life in freedom and peace. I purpose to give every possible encouragement to spontaneous and amateur activities—chiefly by letting them alone. To be completely rational is to allow even for irrationality, and though the words over the door of our state are discipline, corporate responsibility, and socialization, once we step over the threshold we will write Emerson's word: Whim. Like him, we hope it is more than that; but we can't bother to explain. You, my dear E., will understand.

Russia and Japan in Manchuria

By LOUIS FISCHER

Moscow, November 13

NEITHER the United States, which rams its will down the throats of Nicaragua and Haiti, nor England, which holds Egypt, India, and Cyprus by main force, nor yet France, which half destroyed the beautiful city of Damascus in order to "pacify" Syria, has any moral right of protest when Japan proceeds to make Manchuria a second Korea. Nor has the League of Nations, for the League completes and confirms the Versailles treaty with all its vivisection of Germany and its colony-snatching.

China, it will be remembered, demonstratively refused to sign the Treaty of Peace in 1919. The Soviet Government, too, is anti-Versailles, and anti-League and anti-imperialist as well. Russia is, therefore, China's alternative to the West. Before Dr. Sun Yat-sen invited Borodin to lead the Kuomintang revolution, he urged the Western nations to participate in the "international development of China" along capitalist lines. They declined. Then the "doctor" turned to Lenin and sent Chiang Kai-shek to Moscow to plead for aid. The Manchurian conflict may soon force China to make a similar choice.

This phase of the Manchurian situation has received little or no attention in the press. Yet the diplomats keep it ever in mind. Sino-Bolshevik cooperation in the Borodin period (1924-27) of the Chinese revolution sent a tremor through the British Empire and seriously disturbed America and Japan. Such cooperation must not recur. Hence, in part, the Sinophile attitude of the Western Powers. Hence, in part, their desire to exclude Russia from the international efforts to dislodge Japan from her new military positions in South and North Manchuria.

The Powers also seek—by checking Japan—to serve their direct national interests in the Far East. This is especially true of the United States, whose traditional policy calls for opposition to Nippon's intrenchment on the Asiatic mainland. Good-will for China in the present crisis, moreover, may help America and England to capture some of the trade which Japan is losing. Russia does not fit well into such plans.

Yet what could be more natural than to invite the U. S. S. R. to join with the other nations in their attempt to halt the Japanese advance? The Soviet Union is coterminous with Manchuria. Next to China, Russia has most to lose from Japanese aggression. The Bolsheviks have consistently attacked imperial aggrandizement, are therefore in an impregnable moral position to inveigh against the Japanese occupation. Their association with the Powers in demanding the evacuation of Manchuria would strengthen those Powers and weaken Japan. Yet Moscow has been barred from the council chambers of Geneva, Paris, and Washington.

If the United States or some other nation had invoked the Kellogg pact in the Manchurian affair, the Soviet Government might have supported the effort. The United States State Department probably feared that this would involve America's *de jure* recognition of the U. S. S. R. Moscow, to be sure, has officially accepted Frank B. Kellogg's interpretation that there can be no recognition without the intention to recognize. But the bureaucrats of Washington shudder lest an unsuspected loophole should admit a Soviet ambassador or negotiator to the sacred city on the Potomac. I believe this anti-recognition played its role. America acted through Geneva for other reasons. It did not wish to share China's gratitude, if there will be any, with Russia. It desired to curry favor with France on the eve of M. Laval's visit to the White House. For if Washington cannot sign a guaranty pact to protect poor weak France against a viciously armed and prosperous Germany, it can at least give its sanction to the Versailles treaty by appearing at Geneva in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a most important crisis. That was the first step. The next was the carte blanche which President Hoover gave France to deal with Germany alone—in the spirit of Versailles.

Whether because Russia is barred from international endeavors to stop Japan in Manchuria, or because those endeavors have been half-hearted, or because Tokio refuses to be deterred by mere diplomatic notes, threats, and demarches, Japan remains in Manchuria. Seen from Moscow —a good point of vantage for Chinese events—Japan will continue to remain in Manchuria. It will not evacuate on November 16 nor soon after that. The Bolsheviks are of the opinion that even if the island empire, for considerations of expediency, restricts the area of occupation temporarily, or—what is more likely—gives the military occupation a guise of democracy by creating "autonomous" Chinese puppet states, Japan will not retire from its forward position in Manchuria unless compelled to do so by armed force or economic distress. Tokio chose a day when the foreign countries were too occupied with their own economic troubles to interfere seriously with Japanese designs in China. But authorities here incline to the view that the Mikado's government could no longer postpone the extension of its dominion in Manchuria because of the threat, as yet passive, contained in the growing economic strength of both Manchuria and the Soviet Union.

The Chinese are already building their own railroads in the Three Eastern Provinces. They are developing industries, and getting rich on the soy bean. Mukden's army was the best in China. A few more years of steady progress would enable Manchuria to resist Japanese domination more stubbornly than today. Japan must therefore dig in now. The Five-Year Plan is a further consideration. The center of Soviet industry is moving eastward to the Urals. Magnitogorsk in Siberia will, when completed in 1932, be the biggest steel town in the world. Kuznetzstroi and numerous new Siberian railroads will likewise add to Russia's weight in Pacific affairs. Before it is too late, Japan must take advantage of Moscow's preoccupation with industrial construction and of Manchuria's quickly vanishing feebleness. Japan, therefore, cannot afford to lose in its present struggle. If it submits to outside pressure today, there may never be another chance.

K. K. Kawakami, a well-known Japanese correspondent in Washington, writing in the Baltimore *Sun* of October 16, 1931, compares the present situation with the Sino-Soviet conflict over the Chinese Eastern Railway in the latter half of 1929. This is distortion. Mukden had seized the C. E. R. in July, 1929. During August and September the Soviet Government complained officially about thirty-two armed incursions into Soviet territory by white Russian and Chinese forces. Then, on November 18, the red army undertook reprisals, marched into Manchuria, and compelled Mukden to return the C. E. R. to its joint Chinese-Russian management. In five days the Russians had come and gone. The whole operation, indeed, was so swift that it had ended before Mr. Stimson could find time to invoke the Kellogg pact. He did so anyway, but his invocation took place several days after the complete withdrawal of the red troops. Neither in form nor in intention does the 1929 episode resemble even remotely Japan's present efforts to add Manchuria to her empire, efforts which Mr. Kawakami euphemistically labels "military demonstrations."

Early in the present conflict Japanese troops seized a short sector of the C. E. R. and arrested a few Soviet officials of the line. Litvinov entered violent protest, and Tokio I believe, thereupon promised not to touch the C. E. R. Whether this pledge can be kept if the situation becomes more complicated is open to some doubt. In any event, the Bolsheviks see the possibility of Japan occupying the territory through which the C. E. R. runs without touching the railway itself. The line is Soviet property and operated, in part, by Soviet citizens. By keeping hands off the railroad Japan would deprive Moscow of a formal ground for protest. Nevertheless, the extension of Japanese influence to northern Manchuria is a grave menace to the U. S. S. R. A glance at the map will show that control over the district above Tsitsihar and Harbin would permit Japan, by stepping across the Soviet frontier and cutting the Ussuri Railway, to separate Vladivostok from the body of Siberia and make the Soviet Maritime Provinces indefensible. Russia would thus be robbed of her access to the Pacific Ocean.

High Soviet officials with whom I have discussed the Manchurian situation informally suggest that the immediate objective of Japan's present military pressure northward is the capture of the railway which extends from Tsitsihar southeast over the Nonni River bridge to Taonan to Kirin to the Korean port of Seisin. This line is almost parallel to the C. E. R. Japanese soldiers are quickly completing unfinished sections in the province of Kirin. If this purpose is carried out, the C. E. R. would become a deficit business proposition and an economic liability to both Moscow and Mukden.

To Soviet Moscow it has always been a political liability. I learned recently that Lenin, in a statement that has never been published or even referred to publicly, urged the cession of the C. E. R. to China. In 1924, when the U. S. S. R. and China assumed diplomatic relations, and Karakhan commenced negotiating about the future disposition of the Chinese Eastern, Dr. Sun Yat-sen begged Borodin to use his influence with Moscow to block the surrender of the railway to Manchuria. Mukden at that time was anti-Kuomintang, and Dr. Sun did not relish the idea of strengthening Chang Tso-lin by giving him a valuable and strategic property. Moscow, moreover, always kept in mind that Chinese ownership of the Chinese Eastern might easily tempt the Japanese to seize it. Nevertheless, Soviet politicians are increasingly sympathetic to the idea of the sale of the C. E. R. to a strong national Chinese government. In the midst of the present conflict, however, such a contingency does not and cannot arise, especially since the conquest of parts of northern Manchuria by Japan creates a situation far more important than the seizure of the C. E. R.

How will Russia act in the present crisis? It is safe to say quite categorically that the Soviet Government will not fight Japan unless Soviet territory is invaded. The Bolsheviks are building for the future; they are concentrating on the successful fulfilment of the first Five-Year Plan. A war would upset economic construction.

In view of this firm opposition to war, why should the Soviet Government grant assistance to Chinese generals resisting the Japanese advance? The Japanese have spread throughout the world reports of alleged cooperation between the Soviets and the Chinese General Ma whose headquarters are now at Tsitsihar. The Bolsheviks declare that Japan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hopes, by circulating these rumors, to raise the bogy of a "red menace" and win sympathy for itself among the Western Powers. If the hated Communists are on the march, perhaps Japan can receive international sanction to stay in Manchuria and "stem the red hordes." The attempt was too transparent, and has failed, it seems.

The Bolsheviks are passive and pacific, but observe events with mounting concern. The Warsaw and Helsingfors press indicate that Poland and Finland are watching the Manchurian situation with keen interest. A tiny intervention scare has already appeared in Moscow. When France resumed negotiations with the U. S. S. R. last May, the Bolsheviks, who for years and years had been predicting a foreign invasion "next spring," were forced to take a more realistic view. France has been the arch-enemy. Now France was friendly. But with a Japanese army two days' march from the Soviet frontier, and the appetite of the Japanese military whetted by success and defiance, the Russians again succumb to intervention fears. What if Poland and the Baltics exploited the conjuncture to attack on the West? Obviously, if the Soviets were to become involved militarily in Siberia, Russia's European neighbors would be tempted to take advantage of the opportunity. This is yet another reason why Moscow will avoid war at almost any cost. But peace depends on more than one party. The future is not clear. Moscow, however, does not want to believe that Japan will complicate its own difficult position by provoking a war against the U. S. S. R.

Congress Meets at Last

By ROBERT S. ALLEN

Washington, November 30

ON December 7, a year and a month after its election, the Seventy-second Congress convenes. It will meet at the height of the greatest economic disaster in the history of the country, amid a welter of political chaos and uncertainty, and in almost a void of leadership and program. And as if these circumstances were not enough to insure inaction and futility, the new Congress, owing to the obstructive obstinacy of Herbert Hoover in refusing to call a special session, will confront some of the gravest of domestic and international problems on the eve of a Presidential campaign, with barely six months to function before it will rush to adjourn to attend the national nominating conventions.

The few Progressives in the two houses have alone plans for constructive legislation. They will propose unemployment relief, tax revision, unemployment insurance, water-power regulation, economic planning, farm relief, tariff reductions, and desperately needed political reforms. But although nominally the "balance of power," they are actually, owing to the politically hopeful situation the Democrats find themselves in, in an unpromising position. For as things stand the Democratic leaders are in a cold sweat over their bright prospects in 1932 and fearful of antagonizing big business and the bankers, and so they are profoundly wary of the Progressives' demands and can be expected to sidestep as much as possible, or, if that fails, openly to join with the Republican Administration in defeating any constructive program.

This discouraging prospect will not, of course, deter the Progressives from proposing their measures and pressing them for consideration. In their effort to compel action they have, particularly in the Senate, certain important advantages. Of the ten major committees in that chamber, the Progressives, through the right of seniority, hold the chairmanships of eight. They also have representation on the other two, Finance and Appropriations, with La Follette on the former and Nye on the latter. Holding the chairmanships of these powerful committees, the Progressives are in a commanding position to maneuver their proposals to floor consideration.

In the House the Progressive group, for the most part of mediocre character and caliber and less compactly organized, is wholly without committee influence. Should the Democrats, as is most likely, organize the chamber and take over the committee chairmanships, the Progressives might, if they exerted themselves, bring a certain amount of personal pressure to bear on specific proposals. Representative La Guardia of New York repeatedly demonstrated even during the Longworth-Snell-Tilson hegemony in the House that a fighting Progressive can force important bills before the House against a reactionary and omnipotent Republican machine. Practically alone last session, he compelled action on the Norris "lame-duck" session bill and the Wagner federal employment-exchange measure, both of which had been passed by the Senate, but pigeonholed by the House machine until he maneuvered them on to the floor.

In this session La Guardia will have the support of two youthful Progressives, Thomas Amlie of Wisconsin, a new member, and Paul Kvale of Minnesota, beginning his first full term. Both are able and determined fighters, and with their backing as a nucleus of support the sturdy La Guardia plans a definite line of Progressive action. He will depend on the Senate group to initiate the Progressive projects and to get them through the upper chamber, thus placing them before the House, where he can demand that the new Democratic bosses allow them to be taken under consideration.

Difficult and disheartening as is the situation in Congress, the Progressives face their greatest obstacle to achievement in the occupant of the White House. Herbert Hoover, by his veto of the Norris Muscle Shoals and Wagner employment-exchange bills last session, has shown that if all other means to defeat Progressive measures fail, he will not hesitate to kill them with a veto. The Progressives are determined, however, to force the issue squarely and, if nothing else, put the President on record.

The list of vital legislative needs that confront the new Congress runs the gamut of the nation's economic and political life. It begins with the immediate task of feeding and clothing the ten million unemployed and ends with the question of prohibition. In foreign affairs the situation is no less serious, but in this field the influence of Congress is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

largely confined to the veto power of the Senate on treaties and agreements. The initiative in formulating policies and taking action and the authority to name delegates to disarmament conferences are in the hands of the Executive. Congress must await the result of the President's action in the form of a treaty before it can formally express its judgment. In the present world situation, with the timid Hoover and the bungling Stimson holding the reins of the country's foreign affairs, this is a tragic condition. Senator Hiram Johnson of California has given indications that he will demand a Senatorial inquiry into the profits of the bankers in the handling of foreign bonds and loans. The revelations of such an investigation would probably prove sensational. But it is unlikely that such an investigation can be made, or prove effective, before the one-year moratorium is considered, and even if that were possible, it could not prevent ratification. It would be certain, however, to have a material effect on a possible extension of the moratorium and on efforts to bring about cancelation of the war debts. The Administration's claims about army and navy economies are sheer trumpery and ballyhoo. The actual saving in dollars and cents in the Hoover budget is wholly fictitious, and one of the many fights facing the Progressives will be to defeat items for new warship construction and army equipment.

The domestic legislative issues as they present themselves in their relative importance are as follows:

Unemployment relief. Senator La Follette, with several Democrats, will offer measures calling for an immediate appropriation from the federal Treasury, to be expended through State, county, and local governments, for the feeding and clothing of the hungry and needy. Senator La Follette also contemplates a bill directing the expenditure of two billion dollars, the money to be raised by bond issues, interest and amortization of which are to be covered by increased surtaxes, for a great federal public-works program, including good roads, irrigation, waterways, forestation and reforestation, and government buildings.

Taxation. The Administration, with the support of a large number of Democrats, will attempt to put through a modified sales tax, coupled with some slight increases in the income- and estate-tax rates. The Progressives propose to amend such a plan, eliminating the sales-tax features and appreciably raising the rates on the higher income brackets and the inheritance tax, and enacting an effective gift tax. They will also fight further bond issues to meet the two-billion-dollar deficit in government revenues.

Banking. The Administration will seek a broadening of the base of the Federal Reserve system, and the setting up of a real-estate loan-bank system. The first scheme has already encountered severe criticism from banking authorities in Congress. Senator Glass, Democratic leader, has vigorously denounced the suggestion and will bitterly oppose any attempt of this kind. The real-estate-banks proposal is certain of approval, although there is likely to be a clash over the amount of money the government should contribute to the system.

Unemployment insurance. Senator Wagner will introduce a bill providing for government and employer contribution. Both Republican and Democratic opposition will be present, and the outlook for such legislation is not hopeful.

Employment-exchange system. This bill was passed by the last Congress over the determined resistance of Hoover and Secretary of Labor Doak. Unable to defeat it in Congress, Hoover then vetoed it. Senator Wagner will reoffer the measure and is hopeful of passing it over Hoover's veto, if he again rejects it.

Norris lame-duck-session bill. This hardy perennial has an excellent chance of passage this session. It would then have to go to the States for approval, as it is a constitutional amendment. Hoover cannot interfere with its submission once it passes both chambers. It has been repeatedly passed by the Senate and was approved by the House last Congress. On the demand of the late Speaker Longworth it was amended, however, in a form that was unacceptable to its author, Senator Norris, and failed through refusal of the Republican bosses of the House to recede from their position.

Muscle Shoals. Congress is likely again to enact the Norris bill for government operation, despite the recommendation of the Hoover commission that the property be leased to private interests for fifty years. Hoover is expected again to veto the Norris measure, which was also vetoed by Coolidge. The possibility of overriding a third veto is uncertain.

Utilities. Railroad consolidation, regulation of interstate power, motor-bus regulation, and creation of a Department of Communications are certain to be considered in committee by both houses. The odds are against any legislation on these questions, but there is a possibility that something may be done.

Labor. The anti-injunction bill will be pressed for consideration by the Progressives. It is not unlikely that this measure may be enacted, that is, if it is not lost in the pressure for action on other more urgent issues.

Economic planning. Senator La Follette will introduce a bill setting up a governmental agency for the purpose. It is certain to encounter both Republican and Democratic opposition. Its chances of enactment are not predictable at present. Such a proposal has never been before either branch of Congress.

Agricultural relief. The farm bloc will seek to amend the Federal Farm Board act to include both the equalization fee and debenture. The equalization fee has twice been approved by Congress, and been vetoed. It is likely that both devices will be approved. Hoover has opposed both in the past. What he will do with a difficult Presidential campaign facing him is uncertain. There will also be an effort made to appropriate additional funds for additional stabilization operations by the Farm Board. Senator Brookhart will offer a bill calling for a billion-dollar revolving fund for the buying up and holding off the market of crop surpluses. This is likely to encounter vigorous Administration opposition.

Anti-trust laws. Business will seek drastic revision of these statutes, to permit mergers and consolidations—in the "interest of business stabilization" of course. The chances are against such legislation, unless it is coupled with the economic-planning proposal.

Tariff revision. Senators Costigan and Hull will offer measures for downward revision, and if time permits, it is possible that some legislation may result. But the chances are strongly against Congress opening the tariff question on the eve of a Presidential campaign. The Democrats will do a lot of talking about the iniquitous Republican Smoot-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hawley bill—which was enacted with their votes—but that is as far as they will go.

Veterans' legislation. A new drive for cash payment of the soldier bonus will be made, despite the American Legion's official opposition. Passage of such legislation is largely dependent upon the economic situation. If employment does not improve, the pressure will be great to put through the payment of the remaining half of the adjusted-compensation certificates. Repeal of the "pauper clause" in the law giving World War veterans compensation for non-service-connected disabilities will also be asked. Likewise, increases in the pensions for Spanish War widows and extension of the pension system to widows of World War veterans will be asked.

War policies. The joint commission appointed last year to study ways of "taking the profit out of war" will report, but there is little prospect of any legislation.

Liberalization of House rules. Democratic control may result in some minor modifications of the present boss-rule gag system in the House, but except for some liberalization of the rules permitting the bringing of legislation onto the floor over the objections of obstructive committees, nothing important can be looked for. The Democratic leaders are just as eager as the Republican bosses to hold the House in leash. The close party alignment in the chamber, however, will automatically operate to prevent such a condition of boss rule as has existed in the past few Congresses under the Longworth-Snell-Tilson triumvirate.

Prohibition. There will be a great deal of aimless talk, and nothing done.

England on the Edge of Chaos

By J. A. HOBSON

London, November 15

THE rift in the National lute became manifest as soon as Parliament met. The party allocation of seats in the Cabinet had evoked some sharp criticism in conservative quarters. For the Conservatives, whose preponderance is overwhelming in the two houses, only received a bare majority of the Cabinet posts, eleven out of twenty. Of the key positions one, the Foreign Office, had been allocated to the Liberal, Sir John Simon, while the appointment of another Liberal, Mr. Walter Runciman, to the Board of Trade was regarded as an intended check upon the fiscal policy of Mr. Neville Chamberlain at the Exchequer.

At the opening of Parliament the signs of discord were very plain. Not merely in the disposal of offices but in the interpretation of the "doctor's mandate" the Premier found himself at variance with the great Tory majority. "England does not love coalitions," Disraeli once declared. Nor do the parties to a coalition love their bond of union. The nature of the rift, which must inevitably widen as the government proceeds from general pronouncements to actual policy, is too deep-seated for healing. When Mr. MacDonald, speaking at the Guildhall on the eve of Parliament, said, "We have been witnessing the complete breakdown of national economic self-sufficiency," he was, whether he knew it or not, making a declaration of war against his "National" majority. For the sentiments, convictions, policies of the solid phalanx of 500 Conservatives who pretended to welcome his leadership are definitely opposed to the internationalism upon which he takes his stand. This opposition is expressed in its most naive form in a comment by the *Morning Post,* the organ of the diehard oligarchs. "It is the sum of national policies which makes the world policy." Let each nation look after its own separate interests and the well-being of the world will be secured!

Let nobody feel surprise that this gathering of country sportsmen, industrial magnates, soldiers, lawyers, bankers, and sprigs of our nobility should fall for this gospel of nationalism, and in this crisis of our life insist upon its efficiency as a policy. To those who take a wider outlook it may well seem absurd that at a time when the financial and economic interdependence of nations is painted everywhere in such glaring colors, this enthusiastic self-sufficiency should survive. But it does. The recent general election has demonstrated that the vast majority of our people still believe it possible that we can win security and a return to prosperity by the use of the political and economic resources within our national or our imperial control. This creed is crystallized in the demand for a protective tariff. No sooner had Parliament met than this demand became clamant. The 300 "Page-Crofters," or whole-hoggers, objected strongly to the Premier's announcement of "consideration and investigation" preceding action. A full scientific tariff they would consent to wait for until after the New Year, but emergency measures to stop the "dumping" of imports required no consideration or inquiry. The facts and the remedy were equally assured. When Mr. Winston Churchill plunged into the debate, the issues took a political as well as an economic shape. Excluded from participation in the government, this prince of free traders turned his attack upon the triumvirate—MacDonald, Samuel, Baldwin—insisting that the tariff decision lay not with them but with the electorate whose interpretation of the mandate in favor of protection was quite definite. Here I think he was on strong ground. For though MacDonald thought he had tactfully addressed his appeal to the electorate so as to exclude such a definite approval by including a tariff merely as one among other possible policies for inquiry, Churchill was undoubtedly right in his interpretation of the vote. No Tory candidate concealed his conviction in the efficacy of a tariff, and those liberals who, seeking "National" support, professed free trade were in nearly every case rejected.

With or without the assent of MacDonald and Samuel a full protective tariff (with an awkward cross of imperial preference) is therefore destined for next spring, unless the complete collapse of European finance with possible accompaniments of a revolutionary nature intervenes. Even the "Page-Crofters" have sufficient sense to see that the stabilization of sterling is a necessary condition of a "scientific tariff." But they refuse to wait for measures to stop

(*Continued on page* 640)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Unimp

STUART CHASE'S

Best-seller

MEXICO

A STUDY OF TWO AMERICAS

In Collaboration with Marian Tyler

MEXICO has been on all leading best-seller lists for four straight months because readers as well as reviewers have found it "an alluring picture of that land," "a sturdy thesis gorgeously embellished with human interest," and "an enormously stimulating commentary on the machine age."

The beautiful binding and illustrations by Diego Rivera, foremost of Mexican artists, make it an unusual gift book.

73rd THOUSAND

MACMILLAN $3.00

"A masterly piece of work. A challenge both to the Jew and the Christian. I wish that all Jews and Christians might read it."—*H. A. Overstreet.*

A RABBI TAKES STOCK

By SOLOMON GOLDMAN

Clarence Darrow says:

"This is one of the most powerful books I ever read. Dr. Goldman answers the question of the meaning of the word 'Jew' better than any other writer with whom I am familiar. His argument for the Jews retaining their identity is more convincing than I have so far heard or read. This book will no doubt stimulate wide discussion and strong controversy."

"Sincere, penetrating, forthright and inspiring."—*Professor A. Eustace Hayden* $2.50

HARPER & BROTHERS *Publishers* NEW YORK

CHARLES

By D. B. W

Author of "Franc

A brilliant portrait of Charles the Fifth, milita record of the golden age of the Renaissance. —Boston Transcript. Published jointly with E. V

COWARD-McCANN

TWO PEOPLE By A. A. Milne

The love story of a happy marriage—a thoroughly delightful story ab two thoroughly delightful people. *25th thousand,* $2.

BETTER LEFT UNSAID

Leaves from my Private Diary. By Daisy, Princess of Pl

"Indiscreet—but the charm of her personality makes indulgence inevitabl —*London Spectator.* Best-seller since publication. *12th printing,* $5.

THE STORY OF SAN MICHELE

By Axel Munthe

18th month as a national non-fiction best-seller. *96th printing,* $3.

ENGLAND: The Unknown Isle

By Paul Cohen-Portheim

Saturday Review. "A masterpiece of analysis and exposition, a book t is on its way to becoming a classic." *3rd printing,* $3.

1066 AND ALL THAT

By W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman

Still, as *Corey Ford* remarks, "the most hilarious book of the yea *12th American printing, 81st thousand,* $1.

GRAY'S ELEGY WRITTEN IN A COUNTRY CHURCHYARD

Illustrated by John Vassos

"A charming experiment—a superb achievement."—*John Haynes Holm* $3.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., Inc., 300 Fourth Avenue, New Yo

This illustration used in cooperation with the National Association of Book Publishers.

THIS

You Will Find Some Appropriate Sugges on This Page

. . . AND CONSULT YOUR BOOKSEL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chable Gift

F EUROPE

AM LEWIS

," "King Spider."

f the Holy Roman Empire, and a glamorous oughly brilliant, readable and scholarly book." Illustrated. $3.75

NEW YORK

MANHATTAN SIDE-SHOW

By Konrad Bercovici

The author of "Around the World in New York" pictures here the innumerable tragic, laughable, and sinister side acts that go on under Manhattan's big tent. "It is the eager, uncurbed expression of a man's genuine affection for a place, its people, its moods, its cruelties, and its delights."—*N. Y. Evening Post.* Illustrated $4.00

CHICAGO: A PORTRAIT

By Henry Justin Smith

This book might be called "a romance of the city's birth, growth, and sturdy life," says one reviewer. It is "the only extant portrait . . . which combines its physical, its social, its economic, its artistic, and its historical characteristics in one volume"—writes Fanny Butcher in the *Chicago Tribune*. E. H. Suydam has done full page drawings to distinguish its pages and there is also a frontispiece in color. Illustrated $5.00

At all bookstores

THE CENTURY CO. - NEW YORK

EAR GIVE *BOOKS*

BOOKS carry the true spirit of Christmas giving. They last a long time and they cost little. This year it is not hard to find just the right book for everyone on your holiday list, for the shops are full of interesting new books and old favorites in attractive new editions.

CAPONE Is Through--BUT the Gangs Still Rule!

READ

Muscling In

by
FRED D. PASLEY
author of
"AL CAPONE"

The gangster is "muscling in" on legitimate business. Over 100 major industries in our big cities are in his grip. Today every citizen pays more to the underworld than to the government. Fred D. Pasley tells the startling truth. His pen is fearless; it well needs to be. In the interest of your pocketbook and your personal welfare, you must read the amazing facts in this book.

At Your Bookseller's, $2.00

IVES WASHBURN - - - - NEW YORK

Has Science Discovered God?

Just Published!

A Symposium

Edited by

EDWARD H. COTTON

366 pages 17 portraits

8 Vo. $3.50

MATHER
MILLIKAN
EDDINGTON
CURTIS
CONKLIN
EINSTEIN
HUXLEY
PATRICK
McDOUGALL
THOMSON
PUPIN
LANGDON-DAVIES
STETSON
JEANS
LODGE
BIRD

THOMAS Y. CROWELL CO.
393 Fourth Avenue
New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the flow of imports which they term "dumping." Though dumping properly signifies the importation of goods produced by sweated foreign labor, or "surplus" goods sold abroad cheaper than at home, the term is here applied to imports bought by our merchants so as to enlarge their stocks in anticipation of protection or prohibition measures. The immediate pressure on the government is for the exercise of administrative powers (through Orders in Council) to stop this inflow. The Premier's earlier reluctance to take steps at once without "scientific inquiry" is already overridden, so that the thin wedge of protection may be inserted without delay, and the foundations of agricultural and industrial revival be laid in this shifting government. The superfluous folly of such a radical change of our trading policy at such a time as this, when the drop from gold is already acting as a curb on imports and a stimulus to exports, or in other words, as a complete trade balance, is manifest to all whose eyes are not glued to the immediate interests of particular trades. But the "National" Parliament genuinely believes that by a tariff they can set British agriculture once more upon its legs, absorb the unemployed in industries which shall produce at home the manufactured goods we have been importing, and draw from our imperial resources those foods and raw materials we cannot raise within these isles. The experiment will cost us dear, but the blend of light-headed sentiment and narrow business interests seems likely to prevail.

No consideration is taken of the reactions of such economic nationalism upon our relations with other countries, the hostility engendered abroad when our free markets and those of our colonies are suddenly closed to countries whose economic life has been adjusted to a belief in our free-trade policy. It is not too much to say that the other Powers would never have allowed this country to acquire and hold this quarter of the earth which constitutes our Empire but for the free access given to them for buying and for selling. Instead of consolidating our Empire, protection will dissipate it, partly by internal frictions which will manifest themselves when we ask for a monopoly for British manufactured imports into Empire markets, partly from the political hostilities of foreign Powers inflamed by our economic restrictions.

To raise these new foreign troubles at a time like this, when every part of the world is in the throes of the gravest economic and political disaster history has ever recorded, is indeed a monumental folly. It enhances each of the particular foreign issues which confront us. MacDonald stressed the urgent need of immediate international action for enabling money and trade to become unfrozen and to resume their beneficial flow throughout the economic world. For such a task the willing, intelligent, and quick cooperation of all the nations and their governments is required. During the weeks we have been wrangling over the election of our government, the malady of Central Europe has been growing graver. The prospect of a settlement by negotiation between France and Germany alone is fantastic in its improbability. All the pressure and the wisdom that can be mobilized at Geneva may not succeed in averting a complete collapse of the Gentral Powers. But it should at least be tried.

Now what ground have we for believing that our new Foreign Minister, Sir John Simon, is qualified either to understand this critical situation or to take the requisite initiative in designing bold and essentially risky remedies? All who know him and have followed his career have an immense admiration for his intellectual powers as lawyer, pleader, and debater. But he has neither the kind of knowledge, the gift of sympathy, nor the tact in handling men which belong to a great foreign minister. Cold brilliancy of reasoning goes a very little way toward the equipment that is needed. I have heard many Liberals discuss this appointment and the universal feeling has been one of dismay. Such miracles do occasionally happen, and therefore we may hope that one who has never hitherto displayed any special interest in internationalism or taken part in any constructive policies or movements for the better ordering of the world will reveal those powers of sympathetic understanding and vigorous action he has hitherto concealed so successfully. As I write, the great experiment in internationalism, the League of Nations, is submitted to the most crucial test that has yet confronted it, the prevention of war between its two Far-Eastern members. But for the selfish and foolish plunge into a national election, Mr. MacDonald or Mr. Henderson, with familiar knowledge of the foreign personnel and friendships and with their high prestige, would have been the voice of Britain at Geneva next week instead of this cold intellectual neophyte.

The very foundations of our governmental system are shaken by this shameful election. "His Majesty's Opposition" is an integral part of our parliamentary system, and it can hardly be said to exist any longer. It has no effective leader, and though it held one-third of the electorate to their allegiance, it has less than a fourth of the House of Commons. Many parliamentarians, irrespective of party, deplore this weakness, partly on its own account, partly because so overwhelming a majority breeds indifference or rashness. Will Labor in this country submit to what amounts to a political despotism of capital? There are those who seriously dread a revolutionary frame of mind in the workers, if unemployment continues, wages are cut, prices rise by reason of the tariff, and a return to normal decencies of life seems unattainable. "Five years' penal servitude" under the present government may well seem intolerable. But we are a patient and a law-abiding people, and after all, we, the common people, put these masters where they are.

What Labor must do is to utilize this penitential period for reconstructing its policy and strengthening its organization. For the workers should remember that though their failure at the polls was partly due to the ingenious tactics of their enemies in "framing" a financial crisis, with a slogan that skilfully combined the patriotic with the practical appeal, "your country and your savings," the election would in any case have gone against the Labor Government "upon its merits." Put in as a Socialist Government, to cure unemployment and to socialize the key industries, it had made no serious attempt at doing either. Nor can this be explained by the preoccupations of Mr. MacDonald with foreign affairs or the "correct" Treasury views adopted by Mr. Snowden. The government was not equipped with plans for the constructive economic statesmanship needed to give reality to the vague platform socialism in which it had so long indulged. The members never set themselves to study the steps necessary to secure the unification and national control of banking and insurance, the transport industries, coal mining, electric supplies, bulk sales and purchases of essential

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imports and exports, the public ownership of land, and the reconstruction of agriculture. Some useful work was done by private groups outside of Parliament, but no encouragement was given to their attempts to influence legislation. Under the pretense that they had no majority in the House, they took no steps to satisfy the hopes and expectations of the Labor electorate. It was a false pretense, for a forward group of Liberals had already worked out a large scheme or construction along Socialist lines and their cooperation would have given a working majority.

The Labor Party cannot, however, permanently go under. It is the legitimate successor of the Liberal Party already broken into fragments, one at least of which will soon coalesce into conservatism. At present it lies maimed and broken. The rift between the trade unionists who have hitherto furnished the working members and the finance, and the I. L. P. and other groups who have done the Socialist propaganda still remains a solid obstacle to the attainment of political power by the workers. Though many of the leaders of trade unionism have held Socialist convictions, the rank and file have remained trade individualists, concerned only with the wages, hours, and other conditions of their particular trade. Now a constructive political plan, socialistic in its economics and international in scope, requires the leaders of the Labor movement to undertake two related tasks. One is a closely coordinated inquiry into plans of public ownership and operation which shall secure the efficiency of expert management for the public without the interference of passing politicians and obstructive bureaucrats. The general phases of platform socialism and reform cannot be translated automatically into serviceable applications. Railroads are not coal mines, or coal mines banks, or banks electric services; not in financial structure, area of administration, recruitment of personnel, conditions of work, or use of profits can uniformity be imposed. This close study of changing industries so as to convert them from profit-making businesses into public services can usefully occupy the political economists of Labor during its period of exile.

Not less important is the other task, the political and economic education of a sufficient minority of ordinary working-class citizens, men and women, in the stable principles of their political faith, so as to enable them to check such a stampede as was engineered a few weeks ago. The workers as a whole will doubtless continue to be occupied with their livelihood and their sports and amusements. But they cannot remain wholly indifferent to politics and will look for guidance and advice to that more instructed minority among themselves whose education should be the object of direct concern by the leaders of the Labor Party. The creation of this intelligent minority with informed and independent minds, not frightened by the bogy words bolshevism or communism, and capable of moral leadership in crises, is plainly the great need of our nation. It is essential alike as a safeguard against a revolution of despair and the concealed fascism of a government coming into existence by a faked "consent of the people" and operating by despotic legislation eked out by the unconstitutional method of Orders in Council.

The Federal Farm-Relief Scandal II*

By MAURITZ A. HALLGREN

Washington, November 24

IT is clear beyond question that the Farm Board has had eminent success in at least one direction. It has set up an elaborate marketing system of a sort that ought to put big business to shame. Indeed, the Farm Board's marketing system was conspicuously patterned after big-business methods, and, according to one student of cooperative marketing, "assumed the character of an industrial merger." The atmosphere in which this system was created may be better understood by reference to a speech delivered before the National Livestock Marketing Association in Chicago last March by C. G. Randell, a Farm Board official. Mr. Randell said:

> Alexander Legge built up the International Harvester Company by going out and getting business. That's what we have to do. . . . By 1940 the National Livestock Marketing Association should be handling at least 40 per cent of the livestock of the country, but long before that time the National will be recognized as an important part of our national economic structure, and you will have the same position of leadership in the livestock industry that General Motors, American Telephone and Telegraph, and other giant organizations occupy in their fields. . . .

So it appears that bigger and better business rather than the spirit of cooperation is the guiding philosophy of the Farm Board.

It is perhaps but fair to mention that political expediency was largely responsible for the Farm Board's adoption at the very beginning of its operations of a policy and an attitude that are now undermining the cooperative-marketing movement. The 1929 law was adopted under pressure of a specific campaign pledge. The farmers were clamoring for relief. Hence the Farm Board felt, and in a certain sense justifiably so, that it must act without delay. In its first annual report it said that it had "chosen to act in emergencies at the risk of making mistakes rather than to make no attempt at assistance until it could be sure of the wisest course of action at every point." Yet so many mistakes has it made that one must question whether it was wise in choosing the course of action that it did. For example, except in the case of tobacco, dairy products, and one or two minor commodities, it did not wait until the farmers had had time to effect their own organizations, but hurriedly formed agencies upon its own responsibility and imposed these upon the farmers. It did not even stop to consider whether its "cooperative" organizations were acceptable to the producers, but told the farmers and the existing cooperatives that they must accept these national sales agencies as their own or receive no help from the government.

All the national organizations erected by the Farm

* Part I of this article appeared in last week's issue.—Editor The Nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Board are incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. The board has explained this as follows:

> State cooperative laws . . . lacked flexibility in the mechanics of organization, and contained various restrictions upon places of meeting of stockholders and directors, making operations upon a national scale difficult if not impossible. It was, therefore, determined that the Delaware corporation statutes offered the most available domicile for national marketing cooperatives, and accordingly they were used for the national marketing organizations.

The board did not add that Delaware is notorious for the laxity of its corporation laws. The board's explanation has never satisfied many of the real cooperative leaders or the critics of the Farm Board, who think it peculiar that the board should have selected for this purpose the one State which has no laws governing or controlling the operations of cooperative associations.

Capitalization methods employed by the various national agencies set up by the board have also been severely criticized. Although authorized to issue capital stock to the amount of $10,000,000, the Farmers National Grain Corporation was permitted by its charter to commence business with a capital of $10,000. Actually it started business with paid-up capital of approximately $1,000, and on this basis began handling huge shipments of wheat, and was able to borrow funds from the Farm Board totaling scores of millions of dollars.

The American Cotton Cooperative Association has an authorized capitalization of $30,000,000, but after this association had been functioning for a year, only $769,500 of its capital had been subscribed for, and of this amount only $76,950 had been actually paid in. And in the same period this organization was given the use of government funds totaling over $100,000,000. Stanley Reed, who succeeded George E. Farrand as chief counsel of the board, recently advanced the rather novel theory that when we "look for the capital of a cooperative it will not be found in its stock or its membership liability, but in the commodity which is delivered to the cooperative." However sound this may be, it certainly offers nothing very substantial in the way of security to the government. Senator McKellar of Tennessee raised this point at the hearings held last January by the Senate Appropriations Committee. He asked Alexander Legge, then chairman of the Farm Board, whether if a given cooperative were capitalized at $10,000,000, and that capital were paid in, it would not make the government fairly well secured. To which Chairman Legge replied: "It would be very much better than we are situated at the present time. I wish it were all paid in."

The by-laws of the several national agencies provide that capital shall be created out of earnings, and that this capital shall all be paid up before any of the earnings are divided and distributed to the producers, who theoretically are supposed to be the beneficiaries of the cooperative marketing the Farm Board is sponsoring. Chairman Legge added in his reply to Senator McKellar that the earnings of the national cotton agency "are considerable." The Farmers National has gone to the expense of advertising the fact that it came through its first year with "a substantial profit," notwithstanding that "it was the most disastrous year agriculture has ever experienced." This should be interesting news indeed to the thousands of cotton producers who are now in want, and to the farmers in the several Midwestern States from which cries for help have gone up in the last few weeks.

In the matter of loans the technical conditions laid down by the Agricultural Marketing Act have been observed, but only in so far as these loans have been extended to the national agencies created by the Farm Board. The 1929 law places a maximum of 4 per cent on all loans to cooperatives. Funds from the $500,000,000 revolving fund have been lent at an average interest rate of approximately 3 per cent. But so intricate is the board's marketing machinery that these loans must pass through several hands before they reach the producers. All grain loans go to the Farmers National Grain Corporation. This agency in turn relends the money to the regional cooperatives, which pass it on to the local cooperatives, which in their turn finally lend the money to their individual producer members. At each stop along the way the interest rate is increased, so that by the time the money reaches the farmer the interest rate runs somewhere between 7 and 10 per cent.

The Farm Board not only forced the Farmers National upon the grain-growers, and not only has given that agency a powerful weapon against rival cooperatives in the form of a grain-loan monopoly, but it has publicly informed the grain-growers that it will support the Farmers National to the limit of its own financial capacity. In an announcement published on October 26, 1929, and circulated through the wheat belt, the board said:

> There is a grain cooperative in every wheat State. It is open to the membership of every wheat farmer. The farmer may join, ship his wheat to a designated concentration point, where it will be graded and classed, and draw his advance. The cooperative will market the wheat in orderly fashion through the year and will settle with the farmer on the basis of the final price obtained. The board is confident that, considering the soundness of underlying conditions which affect the price of wheat, the plan described above furnishes a completely safe basis for making loans from the board's revolving fund. *The board places no limit on the amount of government money to be so loaned.* Nearly $100,000,000 is available for this purpose, and, if necessary, the board will also ask Congress to appropriate more. Requests for facility loans should be taken up through the Farmers National Grain Corporation.

It can hardly be said that the Farm Board has not been generous with this national sales agency, whose officials are for the most part professional promoters, and for whose actions (apart from those directly involving government loans) the board disclaims all responsibility.

Section 1 of the Agricultural Marketing Act charges the Farm Board with the task of "preventing inefficient and wasteful methods of distribution." The elaborate marketing machinery erected by the board has not accomplished this purpose. In fact, it has, if anything, simply added to the inefficiency and waste in the distribution of many farm products. In the marketing of livestock, for example, a most complex system has been set up and approved by the Farm Board. One group of farmers and ranchmen—the producers—have contracts with regional sales agencies, which in turn own stock in the National Livestock Marketing Association. Another group has memberships in local shipping associations; these are members of terminal sales agencies, and the terminal agencies own stock in, and have contracts

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with, the national agency. A third group operates through district marketing associations, which have contracts with, and own stock in, an order-buying agency, and this organization owns stock in, and has contracts with, the national association. There are also several cross connections between local shipping agencies, terminal agencies, district associations, and the order-buying agency. Moreover, there are numerous regional-credit corporations, which operate through the National Feeder and Finance Corporation, a subsidiary of the national association. The latter also has another subsidiary known as the National Livestock Publishing Association. Of course, all these organizations have their own offices, managing officials, and individual overhead expenses.

A careful and disinterested critic of the Farm Board has written:

> It is to be questioned whether the national marketing enterprises which have been promoted by the Federal Farm Board can properly be designated as cooperative. They are, of course, mutualized corporations in the sense that residual benefits go to the member patrons and not to stockholders. The patron member, however, has so remote a contact with the organization and so little sense of participation in its management that the essential character of the cooperative association is almost completely lacking. This means, on the one hand, that his continued adhesion to the organization must be based largely upon measurable (and rather immediate) pecuniary benefits, and not upon belief in the value of long-time results to be accomplished through group organization, and loyalty to such constructive programs as he himself has helped to formulate. On the other hand, it means that the potential savings which cooperation proposes to make by utilizing the voluntary and gratuitous participation of its members will to a greater or less extent have to be dissipated in promotional work. This is the major one of the "wastes of competitive capitalistic business" which the cooperative is supposed to avoid. . . .
>
> Reorganization along the lines which have been followed does not promote maximum service at minimum cost. It retains the wastes of competition between selling agencies set up as separate entities with commercial carriers of their own to consider. . . .

This critic furthermore points out that one of the national sales associations "has set up both selling and credit agencies in territories already served by non-adhering associations," and adds that the Farm Board agencies thereby "themselves cause duplication of service and increase the burden of competition and lessen the 'unity of effort in marketing' enjoined by the law."

One of the dangers of a Congressional investigation of the Farm Board is that the direction of the investigation will fall into the hands of the grain and cotton brokers or their political agents in Washington. These people are anxious not only to suppress the board and all its works, but to kill the cooperative marketing movement. James M. Beck, Republican Congressman from Philadelphia, played on this theme recently when in addressing the members of the Chicago Board of Trade—a more than receptive audience—he urged that Congress "bury the present experiment in governmental socialism beyond the possibility of resurrection." Criticism of this sort could doubtless be effectively met if the Farm Board had shown more regard for the letter of the Agricultural Marketing Act instead of following its own free and easy interpretation of the intent behind that law.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter's sighs over the cowboy and his pony, whom he pictured as a "dying race," have brought a lively response from one of the last of the great open spaces—Montana. The letter is typewritten and signed "A Dude Wrangler's Wife." It runs as follows:

> DEAR DRIFTER: I like you too well to stand idly by while you are needlessly unhappy. You evidently like cowboys. So do I, and I bring you the cheering news that, contrary to your observations, they are not members of a "dying race."
>
> True, the cowboy of today may not be the blue-jeaned, tobacco-chewing, two-gun outlaw that he once was, but where did you get the idea there are no more cattle to be driven to shipping-points, no more bawling calves to be caught and branded, no more wild range horses to be wrangled and broken—time-honored occupations of every cowboy that ever lived? Come on out West and see!
>
> There are plenty of good cow ranches left in this part of the country, where it is hard work from daylight to dark, and the cowboys are off to the bunk-house immediately after supper, too doggone tired for any of the musicales so popularized over the radio as the perfect end of the cowboy's day. But it is a horse ranch that would appeal to you, isn't it?
>
> Ever heard of a dude ranch, an honest-to-goodness one, run by a real Westerner who knows every sagebrush flat and mountain range for miles around as you know your paved city streets? Join in with his cowboys in the spring roundup to gather horses from their winter ranges, along with cowboys from neighboring ranches who are riding for the same purpose. Get in behind the chase when they are running five hundred wild-hoofed horses over great flats or straight down mountain sides, and you will find high-heeled boots are as useful as they ever were in keeping a cowboy in his stirrups. You would probably, though, get mixed up with the galloping herd and have to be wrangled out by one of the cowboys. They are as dextrous as ever in handling a stampede and heading it for the distant corrals. Thirty miles is all in a day's ride. Once in the corrals, watching these boys roping out their own brand horses, you will never talk again about a "dying race." A coil, a spin, and zoom! a horse surrounded by hundreds of others milling around is neatly caught.
>
> Then hang around while these same cowboys are branding and breaking the young colts. Maybe there are two hundred to be shod, many of them wild-eyed, and striking and kicking until they are tied down. It is hard work if you are in on it. How about riding all night with the night-herders, or getting up at dawn to help wrangle the herd back to the corrals? Believe me, it is still part of an "honest day's work."
>
> Do you know how cowboys on such a ranch spend their Sundays, their day of rest? They stage a rodeo for their own entertainment—they've been too busy all week for play!

* * * * *

CERTAINLY the Drifter would like to "come out West and see." But he is not entirely convinced. He cannot help remembering how the range has dwindled; how the cattle trails which once stretched from border to border, from the Mississippi to the mountains, have become strings of box cars. Finally, there is that word "dude." The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"dude" used to be a contemptible tenderfoot. Now he is the object of a solicitude that would make an old-time cowboy turn in his grave. THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Hurrah for Mr. Chase!

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to write a few words of admiration for Stuart Chase's article, If I Were Dictator, which appeared in *The Nation* of November 18. I know of no other economist who has so ably analyzed our present condition, nor has anyone offered such excellent, clear, and concise remedies. I only regret that it cannot be published daily for at least six months in all the newspapers of the city, so that its contents might seep into the befuddled minds of the people, as well as into the minds of those incompetent and grasping individuals in whose hands the management of our government has been placed. I am all for the "New Dictator."

New York, November 18 F. TOBY MELNER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your leading article in *The Nation* for November 18, If I Were Dictator, by Stuart Chase, should be read by every adult in the United States. I suggest that you print a few million copies of it and have them distributed.

In this combination of Moore's "Utopia" and Plato's "Republic," modern dress, there is much food for thought. However, Mr. Chase would place his final committee in the hands of the engineering profession. Haven't we had enough engineering "leadership" for several generations? And the law is no better. Why not make up his committee of some editors, literary critics, writers, printers, even musicians and artists? We can offer other suggestions to Mr. Chase when the time actually comes. In the meantime, more power to him.

New York, November 13 EUGENE F. ROBERTS

Up in Rochester

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article Business and the Y. W. C. A., in the issue of November 18, came as a clap out of a clear sky to the interested Rochester reading public. There had not been an inkling in any of the local papers of Miss Ethel Davis's dismissal as industrial secretary at the Rochester Y. W. C. A. on the ground of radicalism and in deference to Mr. George Eastman's bequest proscriptions.

Your publication came by mail to subscribers on Friday, November 13. On Saturday the writer called the managing editors of the two local Gannett newspapers and asked why their readers had had no information about so interesting a matter. He was informed that the newspapers did not know of it. The editor of Hearst's *Journal* was not reached until Monday and he gave the same explanation. The weekly *Christian Century* of November 11 had given editorial comment to the Davis affair, and *The Nation* came along a week afterward with the full facts of the case.

Even then there was no disposition to give out the news. On November 17 the Gannet *Democrat and Chronicle* inconspicuously printed a bare denial by Mrs. Arthur J. Gosnell, president of the Y. W. C. A., that Miss Davis was dismissed because she sponsored radical programs. Mrs. Gosnell, the article said, declared that it was "not the policy of the association to enter into controversies precipitated by annonymous statements, but that . . . implications that the secretary had been dismissed by reason of her personal beliefs on social subjects should not go unchallenged."

Mr. Hearst's *Journal* did not get wind of the disturbance until the *Democrat and Chronicle* article had appeared and a call had been received from the writer. To the great credit of the *Journal* for fairness, on Wednesday, November 18, it published the excellent statement of *The Nation* in full, with a two-column cut of Miss Davis. It was stated that Mrs. Gosnell had no comment to make. The local view in matters of this kind is well presented in the *Christian Century's* comment: "The terrifying bogy of the Chamber of Commerce was dangled before the eyes of the board members of the Y. W. When this seemed likely to prove insufficient, the even more terrifying threat of Mr. George Eastman's displeasure—a threat that seems sufficient to produce any desired result in Rochester—was brought forward."

Rochester, November 22 JAMES L. BREWER

Communist Votes in Britain

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial, MacDonald Smashes British Labor, in the issue of November 11, there appears the statement that "in all England only 74,824 could be found to vote the Communist ticket." This is a misstatement of fact since the Communist Party ran candidates in only 25 or 26 constituencies and there are in all of England over 600 constituencies.

Cleveland, November 20 C. ABRAMS

[Mr. Abrams's point is well taken. However, it must also be remembered that the small number of constituencies is an indication of weakness; and with further constituencies added the Communist votes could hardly have reached a significant total.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

For Syracuse Readers

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Readers of *The Nation* in and about Syracuse, New York, will be interested to learn that Oswald Garrison Villard will speak in Syracuse on Monday evening, December 7, at the Jewish Communal Forum, 222 Cedar Street.

Syracuse, December 1 GEORGE M. HYMAN

Contributors to This Issue

LEWIS MUMFORD is the author of "The Story of Utopias," "The Golden Day," and "The Brown Decades."

LOUIS FISCHER, Moscow correspondent of *The Nation*, is the author of "Why Recognize Russia?"

ROBERT S. ALLEN is a member of the Washington staff of the International News Service.

JOHN A. HOBSON is one of the foremost British economists and a contributing editor of *The Nation*.

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO is the managing editor of *Opinion*.

MAXWELL S. STEWART has made a study of the source material relating to Mr. Hoover's activities in China.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finance

Germany's Creditors Confer

WITHOUT waiting for the Hoover moratorium on inter-governmental debts and reparations to approach its end next June, Germany has called upon the Bank for International Settlements to appoint a committee to examine the financial condition of the Reich, as provided in the Young Plan. Simultaneously with the convening of this committee early in December, another group of bankers will begin its labors, to see what can be done about the commercial and banking credits, totaling some $2,000,000,000, which remain frozen under the *Stillhaltung* agreement instituted at the end of last summer, when it became apparent that any attempt to collect these short-term loans would result in the bankruptcy of Germany.

There is considerable significance in the fact that the activities of these two bodies will coincide in point of time. The two problems are evidently to be considered in the light of their mutual relationship, though the B. I. S. committee will doubtless be enjoined to think about nothing but reparations. Either Germany itself or the much-maligned international bankers proved strong enough to enforce an arrangement which ought to go far toward destroying the fiction that reparations and commercial debts can be kept in separate compartments. If an effort is to be made to keep Germany a going concern, all that country's foreign obligations will have to be studied in their bearings on one another. If receivership and a foreclosure sale are contemplated, the question whether reparations take "priority" over commercial debts may be debated, but hardly otherwise.

From whatever viewpoint it is studied, the prospect of a workable settlement is far from bright. It seems plain enough that reparations payments ought to be drastically reduced; but what government receiving reparations is going to suggest or easily agree to an adequate cut, when to do so might make it impossible for that government to meet its war-debt payments to the United States? The American argument that cancelation of the debts, with corresponding reduction of reparations, would force the American taxpayer to "pay for the war" and that it is a dark plot to save the investments of the international bankers, maintains its wide vogue. Yet it is a well-established fact that practically every pound, franc, and lira which Germany has paid out in reparations has been first supplied to Germany by American banking institutions in the form of loans and short-term credits. Money has been flowing into the Treasury at Washington only after it has flowed out of New York and the innumerable communities for which New York acts as investment center. The flow has ceased, and the amount of reparations and debts which can henceforth be collected will eventually have to be reappraised in the light of that fact.

As far as the short-term debts are concerned, in which the United States is apparently involved to the extent of about $800,000,000 all told, it may be expected that a substantial part will be paid off in the normal course of business, being represented by self-liquidating commercial transactions. The balance must be funded or renewed in some way, with provisions for gradual—very gradual—repayment. A suggestion has come from Germany that total annual payments be fixed at about $166,000,000 a year. This happens to be almost exactly the same figure as the "non-postponable" payments under the Young Plan, which Mr. Hoover's moratorium postponed, but which would have to be resumed if the plan should be again put into operation without change.

S. PALMER HARMAN

More Than Thirty Million Dollars

are spent annually by American Jewry for social service activities.

Jewish communities are becoming more discriminating in engaging professioal social service personnel.

If you have been thinking of social work as a career, you are invited to examine the facilities offered by

THE TRAINING SCHOOL **FOR JEWISH SOCIAL WORK**

(a graduate school)

M. J. KARPF, Director

71 West 47th Street, New York City

Scholarships and fellowships ranging from $1,000 to $150 are available for specially qualified candidates.

FREE SPEECH FOR THE CONSUMER

The playgoer is offered critical and independent comments on new plays. The reader of books, too, is afforded such outspoken opinions. Why is it that the consumer of food, automobiles, household appliances, soaps, clothing and everything else which anyone buys, spends his money on the basis of advice coming from one source alone—the man who has the goods to sell!

CONSUMERS' RESEARCH Alone

offers comment and counsel to help you deal in a practical, money saving fashion with the higher arts of trade. If you want to know what physicians know about your favorite mouthwash, what engineers say about your neighbor's automobile, and your aunt's dearly bought vacuum cleaner, read Consumers' Research confidential Handbook of Buying, and bulletins.

$2 a year brings you:

The annual confidential Handbook of Buying, which is a condensed guide to the market on the things you buy, listing (with some analysis of prices and costs) as **recommended** and **not recommended**, many of the goods and services which you use.

Three or four confidential bulletins, which report new tests and research in detail and offer items of substantial interest about current advertising frauds and absurdities;

AND BEGINNING NOW

Three non-confidential bulletins, similar in scope to the confidential ones, but containing material which may be shown to anyone.

All subscribers must sign an application blank pledging themselves to hold certain material confidential. Send for application blank and circular to

CONSUMERS' RESEARCH, N2
340 West 23rd Street New York City, N. Y.

F. J. SCHLINK, Technical Director

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books, Drama, Films

The Pressure

By MARK VAN DOREN

"From so much pressure, peace!"
Praying, he fled as far as to a town
Where the in-thrust of four shoved walls could cease,
And care lie down.

And they stood still, and care,
Ghastly upon her death-bed, stayed behind.
But what he came to feed drank only air—
His spirit's mind,

Spinning without a load,
Grew giddy in the warm, the melting day;
And the strong column of his courage flowed
In rain away.

He knew not this of men:
How the soul glistens like a shaft of ice,
Till sudden freedom thaws it; and how then
It perishes twice.

Science and Poetry

The Literary Mind. By Max Eastman. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

IN "The Literary Mind" Mr. Eastman sets forth, always with fluency and vigor and often with brilliance, the general thesis that science, having displaced magic and religion and abstract philosophy as a source of help and guidance, is now successfully invading the field of "literature," and that as it advances remorselessly "literature" is compelled to retreat. All the leading critical controversies of recent years he views as mere battles of this great war. He begins by lumping together the humanists led by More and Babbitt with the "neo-classics" led by T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Allen Tate, Edith Sitwell, and others. Though members of these two groups frequently quarrel with each other, Mr. Eastman does not believe that their hostility is very deep.

> What they are quarreling about is the *plan of campaign* against their common enemy, science. The real war which they are both waging with all their hearts—the one under the banner of "intellect," the other under the banner of "morals"—is a war in defense of the ancestral preserves of humane letters against the encroachments of verified knowledge. They are fighting for the right of literary men to talk loosely and yet be taken seriously in a scientific age.

And that is why both groups patronize or disparage science at every opportunity, why they so tirelessly point to its "limits" and fear that it is "overstepping its due bounds."

> *Thus far shalt thou go* is what they both say to the spirit of verified knowledge as it begins to encroach upon fields sacred to the free, the pure, the literary eloquences.

It is Mr. Eastman's firm conviction that these groups are fighting a hopeless rearguard action. Not only are they destined to retreat before the march of science, but so are the old pretensions of "literature" itself, and particularly of poetry. "Intellectual poetry" is a contradiction in terms; poetry must abandon all doctrine, all moralizing, all "ideas," all claims to give us knowledge, or even to *interpret* experience. "Pure" poetry, as Mr. Eastman views it, should be without "meaning"; it should communicate "the immediate qualities of experience," but not presume to tell us anything *about* experience; its business is to "intensify" life, not to illuminate it.

Now though Mr. Eastman's brilliant polemics delight me immensely, I regret that I do not find his own main thesis entirely tenable. Whether that thesis is right or wrong obviously depends upon the sense in which we use such crucial words as "science," "literature," and "poetry." Mr. Eastman himself has great sport pointing to the "thousands" of "literary definitions" of poetry, and mercilessly analyzing some of them, but he does not seem to recognize that the word "poetry" cannot be precisely defined for the very simple reason that it is never precisely used. A loose word obviously cannot have more than a loose definition. And Mr. Eastman's own definition, while shrewd and suggestive, is no more "scientific" than any of those he derides. Poetry, he tells us, consists of words used to "communicate experience" itself, while practical or scientific talk is made up of words used to "interpret experience or convey knowledge about it." Now a scientific definition ought to be *literally* true, and it is of course literally impossible to communicate an experience. To read the greatest poet's most poetic description of a dinner is not equivalent to having a dinner. To read a poem on the embraces of Julia is not the same as enjoying them. The same criticism would apply to Mr. Eastman's further statement that poetry "is made out of the immediate qualities of experience." It is merely made of words (symbolic noises) that *recall* these qualities. As for Mr. Eastman's insistence that it is not the business of poetry to "interpret" experience, one can only remind him that the whole of language is, inescapably, an interpretation of experience. To be sure, language is merely our common social interpretation of experience; but the use of original metaphor by the poet certainly involves an individual interpretation. When Keats refers to oak trees as "green-robed senators" he is interpreting them; he is making us see them under a new aspect. Mr. Eastman accuses I. A. Richards of not understanding the function of metaphor, but one wonders about his own understanding when he makes the astonishing remark that "metonymy and metaphor . . . do not explain like maps or illustrations, but rather obscure the meaning of the sentence in which they occur." On the contrary, good metaphor vivifies meaning. When Shelley talks of flocks of clouds "*shepherded* by the slow, unwilling wind" he conveys his meaning more clearly and briefly than he possibly could in prosaic terms.

Ordinarily some of the criticisms I have made here might be set down as mere quibbling, but Mr. Eastman pushes his distinction—which is fundamentally a sound and an important one—between poetry and practical or scientific language to such a confident extreme that it is necessary to make them. The poet who deliberately condemned himself to writing merely what Mr. Eastman calls "pure poetry" would stultify himself, and poetry written in accordance with Mr. Eastman's theories, even granting that it would not be meaningless, would for the most part be trivial. Indeed, at one point in his book Mr. Eastman himself makes this remarkable confession:

> I think my own poetry has suffered from the too controlling sense I have had of this inherent divergence of two functions. . . . I would gladly find a way of escape from the dividedness and put myself into a book of poetry as a whole man. . . .

Yet it never seems to have occurred to him that his poetry may have suffered from his theory because his theory was wrong!

The great defect of Mr. Eastman's thought in the present

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volume, it seems to me, is that of over-simplification—a tendency, in general, to assume that whatever is not white must be black. This is the fallacy of his highly entertaining chapters on the Cult of Unintelligibility and Poets Talking to Themselves. Because complete unintelligibility would be fatal to a poem, it does not follow that even a certain degree of obscurity is necessarily an evil: enough strychnine will kill you, but a small amount is a tonic. One can only tell whether the amount and kind of unintelligibility is a defect in any poem by a direct reading of that particular poem. This fallacy of extremes underlies also Mr. Eastman's main argument. It was, of course, a pathetic error for Robert Bridges to try to put scientific truths into "The Testament of Beauty" in scientific language:

> First among the lowest types of life we think to find
> no separation of sex: plants in the next degree
> show differentiation at puberty with some signs
> of mutual approachment: next in higher animals
> an early differentiation, and at puberty
> periodic appetite with mutual attraction
> sometimes engaging Beauty. . . .

But this does not mean that it is an error for the poet to make *any* pronouncement. The speech of Macbeth beginning "Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow" may not embody a truth demonstrable by science, but it will always be great poetry, regardless of any scientific advance. Indeed, after Mr. Eastman has so severely limited the field of poetry, he admits in a later chapter that "literature, as a thing distinct from science, may be a pure communication of experience; it may interpret experience in spheres as yet untouched by science; it may offer interpretations as intellectual things to be enjoyed and without a tense regard to their validity. . . ." Well, poetry may do at least as much; and though I am just as suspicious as Mr. Eastman is of the over-anxious attempts of the humanists and others to keep science within its "due" bounds, I suspect that the regions unconquered by exact science will remain vast for several thousand years to come, leaving plenty of room for the poet and the literary man in the meantime. Mr. Eastman, at bottom, is trying to say to the poet: *"Thus far shalt thou go"*—and that is a mistake. If it is unwise to set definite and precise bounds to the sphere of science, it is just as unwise to set them to the sphere of poetry.

It seems to me, indeed, that Mr. Eastman has crowded poetry out with science partly by an unconscious trick of definition. Not only is his definition of poetry too narrow, but his definition of science is extremely broad, not to say lax: he remarks on his first page that "science is merely the persistent and skilled use of the mind and the stores of human knowledge about any problem," and later that "science is nothing but a persistent and organized effort to talk sense." If such definitions were accepted, it would be difficult to find anyone who did not favor "science" as against "literature," particularly when the latter is defined, by implication, as just a loose, irresponsible, and emptily rhetorical way of speaking. But much of what Mr. Eastman calls "science" in this book is *really* nothing more than shrewd common sense, and much of what he derides as "literary loose talk" I should deride with him, not because it is literary, but because it is loose.

I wish to make it clear, however, that in all these criticisms I am objecting rather to the dogmatic extreme to which Mr. Eastman carries his thesis than to his general approach to the problem, with which I have considerable sympathy. To many of the individual questions with which he deals he has brought acute analysis, a fine clarity, and solid sense. His exposure of the critical inconsistencies of T. S. Eliot, and of the psychological dilemmas in which I. A. Richards has involved himself, is admirable. Altogether he has written one of the most readable, provocative, and important critical volumes in recent years.

HENRY HAZLITT

Both Photographic and Art

Time Exposure. By Parkhurst Whitney. Farrar and Rinehart. $2.

EVERY so often American critics hear through the din of sensational shouts and murmurs, charlatanism and mummery whereby the writers of today are made conspicuous and important the insistent and penetrating voice of genius. They then make up in hullabaloo and ballyhoo for their previous neglect, and force on an unprepared public another "master" and another "masterpiece."

I shall be greatly surprised if this is not Mr. Whitney's fate within two or three years. He will be "discovered" as an original creative artist and a profound interpreter of American life; he will be mentioned as a candidate for that mythical deed, the writing of "the great American novel." And this will occur when the inevitable reaction against the two dominant styles of our fiction will again set a true valuation on simple narrative, clear insight into character, and a compassionate consideration of normal human problems.

Today the novelist treats his subject either with the simulated insouciance of James Joyce or—less frequently than yesterday—with the stimulated indignation of Sinclair Lewis. He is more concerned with making a point or pointing a moral than with depicting life. He is either searching, chemist-like, for new elements and new formulae in the old materials or, lawyer-like, putting normal experiences to a hostile inquest. These may be interesting experiments, but they are not creative fiction.

Mr. Whitney is neither chemist nor district attorney. He is an artist. He recreates the period in American life between the Spanish-American War and the World War, and he is content to present it with photographic accuracy. He permits himself no distortion in the name of those shibboleths of aesthetics and sociology which are so glibly uttered in defense of new forms. For Mr. Whitney exercises his creative function in portraying the development and relationship of his characters rather than in the narration of events. Thus, while focusing his study on the individual, he achieves a complete panorama, intimate in detail, rich in color, and true in perspective.

Chester, the bumptious, effervescent, up-and-coming youth of small-town America, marries Fannie, the village belle, prudish, ignorant, and undersexed. He takes her with him in his rise to affluence and importance. He is the dominant male; he is her master. But there is a balance struck by the author as interesting as it is subtle. Fannie is boss in the domestic relationship. As the recipient of his ardent desire, as the guardian of a misunderstood virtue, as a censor of his lapses, she rules him and guides him and leads him into the doldrums of respectability. For all her innocence and his sophistication, she is the wiser; she understands him better than he understands her or himself. She is both his hitching-post and his spur.

It would have been easy to take a superior attitude toward this groping couple in a dark environment, to make their ambitions seem tawdry, their problems petty, their romances crass. But Mr. Whitney chose the more difficult task of writing with such understanding and compassion that he communicates to us the absolute importance of his characters. We recognize the essential human dignity of their experiences and we participate emotionally in their poignant anxieties, sorrows, and joys.

Simply, economically, almost reticently the author unfolds his story. It is meaty writing, mature in thought, robust in humor, and polished in style, although the jaded public may find its tone unusually subdued and its treatment of sex too consciously restrained. By his easy familiarity with the early days of our century Mr. Whitney is able to add an old-time flavor to this distinctly modern chronicle, a flavor which is at times

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so insistent that it hides the true essence of the more contemporaneous incidents. These scenes, depicting Chester's and Fannie's experiences on the "home front" during the war, form the most impressive section of the book. And Chester, at any rate, emerges from them as one of the figures that dominate the post-war generation—the standpat patriots who chose Harding and Coolidge and Hoover to enforce our prohibition law and to enhance our prosperity. JOHAN J. SMERTENKO

Hoover's Missing Years

The Strange Career of Mr. Hoover Under Two Flags. By John Hamill. William Faro, Inc. $3.75.

The Great Mistake. By John Knox. Washington: National Foundation Press. $3.

THE popular myths about our Presidents die hard. The legend of the Great Engineer who earned the right to the highest office which the American people can bestow by virtue of his extraordinary administrative abilities has been especially pertinacious because of the mystery which has shrouded his activities before the outbreak of the World War. It comes as somewhat of a shock, then, to discover that Herbert Hoover had not only had very little practical engineering experience, but, if we are to believe the evidence set forth in these two books, he had not even had a great deal of actual administrative experience prior to his arrival in the United States in 1917 to take charge of the Food Administration. He was, we are informed, a promoter, a financial wizard if you like, whose transactions related chiefly to stock operations.

Why these books should appear just now it is difficult to understand, unless it is in connection with the coming campaign. One would think that the time for these charges to have been brought out was when Mr. Hoover was a candidate for the Presidency, when he would have been obliged to face the issue squarely. Now the average person will say that it is unfair to bring up the past of a man who justly or unjustly is President of the United States at a very critical period of American history. At the same time, the very seriousness of the charges makes it impossible to ignore them lest the press itself be charged with being in a conspiracy to prevent the public's knowing that such volumes have been issued. So far as Mr. Hamill's book is concerned, it is gravely weakened by the author's indubitable malice, and both books suffer from the fact that the publishers do not rank high in the publishing world.

Many of the charges made against Mr. Hoover are so sensational that most intelligent readers will at once dismiss them as preposterous except where they are backed up by documentary evidence. As his activities have been scattered throughout the world—Australia, China, England, Burma, and Central America—the mere collection of these data must have proved a stupendous task. Hoover's first success, according to Mr. Hamill, came when, by reporting the prospective yield of one of his Australian mines as several times larger than previous tests had shown it to be, he enabled his firm, Bewick, Moreing and Company, to gain a profit of two million dollars from the pockets of none-too-wary investors. Next he was sent to China in 1899 as agent for the company, where he pulled off the greatest coup of his career as a "mining engineer." Under the pretext of aiding the Chinese in developing the Kaiping mines through the introduction of British capital, he is charged with having fraudulently wrested the valuable mines and property of the Chinese Engineering and Mining Company from its Chinese owners and with having put himself in a controlling position.

The whole story came out five years later when Chang Yen-mao, former director general of the Chinese mines, brought suit in the British courts on behalf of the Chinese shareholders to compel Hoover's firm to live up to the agreement by which it had obtained control of the property. After one of the most protracted legal contests of the day, Justice Joyce issued a stinging judgment against Bewick, Moreing and Company, declaring that "under the circumstances . . . to allow the defendant company, while they insist upon retaining the benefits of the transfer, to escape from the obligations of the memorandum [i. e., to restore Chinese control] . . . would be contrary to one of the plainest principles of equity and would be to sanction such a flagrant breach of faith as could not be tolerated by the law of any country."

After his success in thus obtaining one of the richest mines in China for Moreing and himself, and, in addition, in seizing by main force the title deeds which put the port of Chinwangtao under British control, Hoover was taken into the firm of Bewick, Moreing and Company in 1901. His record during the next ten years, according to Mr. Hamill, was if anything even more interesting than it had been up to this time. One case is cited in which Mr. Hoover's partner in a certain deal went to prison while he himself not only went scot-free but even repudiated his share of their joint debt. The author also connects Hoover closely with the scheme whereby the Chinese Engineering and Mining Company, Limited, negotiated the sale of some 50,000 Chinese into conditions amounting to virtual slavery in the mines of South Africa. For the most part, however, his activities are reported to have consisted chiefly of organizing and manipulating mining corporations.

The author does not even give Mr. Hoover credit for unselfish activity in connection with the Belgian Relief. He implies, although without definite proof, that the Belgian Relief was initiated by the Germans in 1914 so that they might confiscate the food supplies already existing in Belgium for their own use, and that it served to prolong the war. Most of this is unworthy of credence.

Although there is no way of completely checking the accuracy of all the facts presented by Mr. Hamill, the reviewer happens to be familiar with the source material dealing with Mr. Hoover's activities in China. Since this part of the record seems to be free from any serious error, the presumption would be that the author's factual statements are in the main correct, a presumption which is given added support by the fact that there has been no denial from the White House nor any effort to challenge the book in the courts. It is exceedingly unfortunate, however, that a work of such political importance should be so badly and clumsily written. One has the feeling, moreover, despite the abundance of detail, that the book was hastily thrown together. For instance, the section on Hoover's exploits in China could have been made considerably stronger if the author had gone into the records more carefully and discovered (1) that it was not until after Chang Yen-mao had been falsely arrested in Tientsin that Detring was able to secure the power of attorney which enabled him to transfer the Chinese-owned mines to Hoover; (2) that although Bewick, Moreing and Company resorted to every legal device to overthrow the decision of Justice Joyce, it was upheld by the Court of Appeals on January 24, 1906; and (3) that there are still other cases on record where Bewick, Moreing and Company were convicted in court of breach of contract and of what appear to be extremely dishonest dealings.

While not nearly so comprehensive, Mr. Knox's book is much more satisfactory. The author is content, for the most part, with presenting the facts as they appear in the original documents and allowing the reader to pass judgment. The book is marked by an almost complete absence of rancor, and in many respects supplements the material contained in the longer volume. This is particularly true in regard to Mr. Hoover's record while in charge of the Food Administration. Evidence is brought forth which indicates that through his ap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointment of men like Rolph and Babst to the international committee on sugar, the American public was made the victim of the large sugar interests. Mr. Knox strongly intimates that Mr. Hoover was personally responsible for the acute sugar shortage which existed during and after the war. It is also charged that sugar which America had purchased was actually being delivered to Germany.

If only a small fraction of the accusations which the authors of these two volumes make against Mr. Hoover is true, they have performed a public service in bringing them to the attention of the country, regrettable as they are. On the other hand, if they are false, the authors should be punished to the full extent of the law. MAXWELL S. STEWART

Books in Brief

Strict Joy, and Other Poems. By James Stephens. The Macmillan Company. $1.25.

James Stephens is important as a poet for his sensitive and original studies in rhythm and for the directness and simplicity in wording and in imagery with which he so naturally conveys his emotion. This last book has a number of new and delightful rhythmic studies. And it has a new note of seriousness too, although the ironic humor is not lost, and unusual rhythms to convey this seriousness:

> Speed, skill, nor courage; goodness, wisdom, beauty,
> May not retard, refuse it, nor avoid!
> In one same terror, and in common ruin,
> Strait, to the darkling blank, and grim abrupt,
> These all—our known, mode of our life—and we,
> Murdered and murdering, go hasty down!
>
> Into not-known, into vacuity!
> Into unbottomed dreadful, and a dark!
> Where life saith—No, I go not—and is gone!
> Where naught is but which would, and utter cannot!
> Where, in black blank and null, the wary ghost
> Hearkens, nor hears; and, with no voice, would wail!

Poems like this, of which there are a series in this volume, are the first I have seen which take over something of Gerard Manley Hopkins's method without being out-and-out imitations of Hopkins. James Stephens never fails to keep his own striking originality. The "strict joy" implied in this volume is the eternal joy of lyric singing. Thought is to no end and faith may darken, but song, for this poet, is always release from questioning. His is the perfect lyric gift.

The Silver Eagle. By W. R. Burnett. The Dial Press. $2.50.

Mr. Burnett has returned to Chicago and the gangsters to good purpose. "The Silver Eagle" is a good rapid-fire yarn even though it is not so good as "Little Caesar." The principal character is a young self-made man who owns a string of restaurants, who becomes involved, socially, with a group from Chicago's aristocracy, and, in a business way, with Joe Molina, the boss gangster, and his mob. The aristocrats are not very interesting. And the hero himself is not very convincing. But Mr. Burnett's dialogue is, as always, good, and there is a lot of it. The story is exciting.

The Haunted Jester. By Donald Corley. Robert McBride and Company. $2.50.

This volume is a collection of short stories about mysterious events ancient and modern—Tibetan priests and topaz-eyed babies, dead knights and red-headed ladies, inscrutable bored ladies who go off with pirates—written in the excruciatingly thick, heavy, ponderous style of which Mr. Corley is a master.

The Brick Row Book Shop, Inc.

42 East 50th Street
New York City

Important Sale!

Discontinuing this branch of its business, The Brick Row will sell without reserve, beginning, December 5th, its well selected, collected stock of Memoirs, Belles Lettres, Biography, Modern First Editions, Private Press Books, etc., at substantial and extraordinary reductions, for cash.

This miscellaneous assortment comprises the first collection of importance ever offered in this City at similar prices.

Immediate inspection is suggested for those seeking interesting Christmas gifts.

If You Have Any Problems to Solve
CONSULT OUR CLASSIFIED PAGES
If you cannot find what you want, send in your requirements. Minimum 30 words, $3.08. Additional lines of 6 words, 62c.
THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York
COrtlandt 7-3330

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberalism in Mexico. By Wilfred Hardy Callcott. Stanford University Press. $5.

Historical treatment of "liberalism" in Mexico is timely since that brand of social thought has now become virtually extinct among those who control the nation's destiny. Professor Callcott covers the period from 1857, when Mexico's true revolution had just begun, to 1929, when it reached the vanishing-point. It was in the latter year that former President Calles, once the most unflinching of *revolucionarios,* decided from the quasi-retirement of his revolution-acquired *hacienda* that the agrarian-reform program had been a mistake. It was in that year that the lure of American prosperity (pre-crash) finally quenched the feebly sputtering spark of revolutionary ideology and made *turismo* the sole surviving "ism." Professor Callcott gives a factual recital based chiefly on secondary sources.

A History of Indian Literature, from Vedic Times to the Present Day. By Herbert G. Gowen. D. Appleton and Company. $4.

It is difficult to obtain a clear conception of Indian literature from Professor Gowen's book. Three-quarters of his six hundred pages are concerned with scriptural writings and commentaries which are of little interest as literature. The few sections devoted to secular literature are treated with bibliographic thoroughness but with no literary discernment. It may be useful as a reference work, but even with its mass of excerpts, most of them in dull translations, it can give only a poor contact with the civilization it aims to describe through its literature. A reading of Kalidasa's "Sakuntala," obtainable in the Everyman's Library, will far better serve that purpose.

Life of Cardinal Newman. By Gaius Glenn Atkins. Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

Clarity and simplicity distinguish Dr. Atkins's "Life of Cardinal Newman." The clarity is commendable; the simplicity must be counted a fault. For the Abbé Brémond, when he called his own brilliant volume "The Mystery of Newman," was being accurate and not sensational. Newman is one of the mysteries of his age, a man who, amid the fierce material and intellectual broils of the nineteenth century, thought in the terms of a medieval saint. And though Dr. Atkins's calm account of this man is always faithful and fair and in a certain sense understanding, it seldom does more than hint the terribly complex problem which the biographer of Newman must face.

Drama

Sham Battle of the Sexes

ALFRED LUNT and Lynn Fontanne constitute what is certainly the most popular "team" now performing in our theater. They play up to one another with an expertness born of long practice, and though each is an excellent actor in his own way, neither is so good alone as the two are together. Perhaps the secret of their charm has something to do with the fact that they embody so well a certain romantically comic conception of the relation between man and woman, and present in so gallant a fashion the amusing aspect of what used to be called by the grimmer psychologists the Battle of the Sexes.

Mr. Lunt is reckless, dashing, and impudent. Miss Fontanne is sly, capricious, and deliberately provocative. But to these qualities each adds a certain knowingness which belongs with the racy sort of comedy which they play. Though the pattern of their conduct is romantic enough, it is always plain that each knows very well what it is all about, and plays the game for the game's own sake. The one is no simple maiden startled out of the dreams of innocence; the other no passionate pilgrim deluded by his own eloquence. The battle is sham because neither has any intention of holding out, and the joke is inherent in the fact that the struggle is over nothing except those inessentials invented for the purpose of providing the hors-d'œuvre of love. Thus Mr. Lunt and Miss Fontanne give lessons in the art of preventing sophistication from taking the fun out of life. They show how the uniforms may be splendid and the military bands may be real even if the swords are only tin.

As for "Reunion in Vienna," the new play in which the Guild is presenting them at the Martin Beck Theater, it would probably not seem as good as it does if it were not so delightfully played. Though Robert Sherwood, the author, has concocted a rather amusing tale in what we are pleased to call the "Continental" manner, there is in the comedy itself little to distinguish it from a dozen other competent jobs of the same sort; but it does, on the other hand, afford so excellent a romp for Lunt and Fontanne that few will ask for more. The former was never better than he is in the role of the exiled Hapsburg returned after ten years to visit his old mistress; the latter was never more charming than she is as this same old flame now respectably married to an almost too reasonable psychoanalyst; and if any squeamish members of the audience find themselves made uncomfortable by the way in which the two roll on the couch together in an ecstacy of pure recollection, then these squeamish members should—like the farmer who watched the mixed acrobatic team in the circus—remember that in private life Mr. Lunt and Miss Fontanne are respectably married to each other.

The situation is this: Mr. Lunt maintains that in order to lay the ghost of memory he should spend the night with his former mistress. The psychoanalyst agrees to the extent of confessing that it would be fatal for him to forbid this therapeutic measure, and so, leaving the two together, he informs his wife that she must decide for herself. Next morning no questions are asked, and the audience, as well as the husband, is left to guess what really happened. Did Miss Fontanne consent or did she not? Now, I do not know whether I am supposed to give an answer, but if I am, then my guess is yes, and I base it upon a certain blankness which passed over Miss Fontanne's face at the instant when she had just said "no" so effectively that the departing Hapsburg shut the door of his bedroom behind him. At that moment the second-act curtain descends, but a temptation is never so seductive as in the instant when we are struck by the fear that we have just succeeded in conquering it once for all. It leaves an emptiness behind which only the forbidden can fill, and it is at that moment that we begin to hunt eagerly through the tall grass for the apple we have just thrown away. Surely it was thus that Eve fell, and it was Eve who set the old fashion which never changes.

The Actor-Managers, descended in some fashion from the old Neighborhood Playhouse company, have been responsible for some very interesting productions in the past, but "If Love Were All" (Booth Theater) is an amateurish and feeble little comedy which leaves one wondering what—if anything—its author intended. "Sing High, Sing Low" (Sam Harris Theater) suffers somewhat from its inability to decide whether it wants to satirize or burlesque the opera, but it is amusing nevertheless, and its picture of the goings-on at the Cosmopolitan Opera House is both funny and a little scandalous. "Steel" (Times Square Theater) is a labor play that means very well indeed but only serves to show again how difficult it is to make propaganda into interesting or convincing drama. Edith

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

☐ PLAYS ☐ FILMS ☐ LECTURES ☐ DEBATES ☐

MAURICE SCHWARTZ and HELEN MACKELLAR
in ERNST TOLLER'S
"BLOODY LAUGHTER"
A drama of heroic protest by the author of "Man and the Masses" and "The Machine Wreckers"
Settings by Robert Van Rosen
49th ST. THEATRE West of Broadway. Evenings 8:40 Mats.: Wednesday and Saturday 2:40

CIVIC LIGHT OPERA CO. PRESENTS
RUDOLPH FRIML'S Operetta **The FIREFLY** *with* ILSE MARVENGA and Superb Cast
Pop. Price Eve. 50c-$2.50. Wed. Mat. 50c-$1.50. Sat. Mat. 50c-$2.
ERLANGER'S THEATRE, West 44th Street, PEnn. 6-7963.

The Theatre Guild Presents
EUGENE O'NEILL'S TRILOGY
MOURNING BECOMES ELECTRA
Composed of 3 plays
Homecoming, The Hunted, The Haunted
All 3 plays will be presented on one day, commencing at 5:30 sharp. Dinner intermission of one hour at 7 o'clock. No matinee performances.
GUILD THEATRE, 52d St., West of Broadway

THE THEATRE GUILD PRESENTS
REUNION IN VIENNA
A comedy by ROBERT E. SHERWOOD
MARTIN BECK THEA. 45 St. & 8 Ave. PEnn. 6-6100 Evgs. 8:40. Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:40

AVON THEATRE, 45th Street West of Broadway
NOW
Every Night, Including Sunday
James B. Pond presents for a limited engagement
Cornelia Otis Skinner
in the novelty sensation of the season
THE WIVES OF HENRY VIII
preceded by some superb character sketches
"Few crowded stages are better worth watching than that on which she walks alone."—Richard Lockridge, *Sun.*
GO NOW! DON'T MISS HER! Limited Engagement Only
Mats. Thurs. & Sat. at 2:45

GILBERT MILLER Presents
HELEN HAYES
in MOLNAR'S New Comedy
THE GOOD FAIRY
With WALTER CONNOLLY
HENRY MILLER'S THEATRE, 124 West 43rd Street
Evenings 8:50 Matinees Thursday and Saturday 2:30

"First American play of the season of any sound quality; a play real in its character, real in its dialogue and consistently intelligent in its approach to its subject matter."—*George Jean Nathan, Judge.*
THE LEFT BANK
By ELMER RICE
LITTLE THEATRE, 44th Street. Telephone LA 4-6620
Eves. $1 to $3. Wed. Mat. $1, $1.50 and $2. Sat. Mat. $1 - $2.50

SING HIGH, SING LOW
By MURDOCK PEMBERTON and DAVID BOEHM
"Malicious and amusing—The Inner workings of a great Opera House. —A grand idea."—*John Mason Brown.* "Exposes the real story that every newspaper man knows and no newspaper prints."—*Burns Mantle.*
EVES. 8:40 SAM H. HARRIS THEATRE, 42nd St. West of Broadway
Matinees Wednesday and Saturday 2:30
ALL EVENINGS, BEST SEATS $3.00

DEBATE
"Is Modern Morality a Failure"
HON. BERTRAND **RUSSELL** says "NO"
DR. STEPHEN S. **WISE** says "YES"
DR. HARRY ELMER BARNES, Chairman
This debate involves the vital issues of
EASY DIVORCE LAWS BIRTH CONTROL
COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17th. 8:30 P.M.
CARNEGIE HALL, 57th St. and 7th Ave.
Tickets $1, $1.50, $2, $2.50, at Carnegie Hall, Columbia U. bookstore (Journalism Bldg., 116 St., and B'way), Rand Book Store, 7 East 15 St., Seven Arts Guild, 125 W. 45 St. (Room 1007). Mail orders promptly filled. *Auspices Seven Arts Guild.*
RUSSELL'S Farewell Appearance

A Clearing House of Opinion **THE GROUP** Meets at Auditorium 150 West 85th St.
Tuesday Evening, December 8th, at 8:30 p.m.
PROF. MAURICE PARMELEE, *speaks on:*
"NUDISM IN MODERN LIFE"
This Sunday Afternoon, at 4:30 p.m. (Dec. 6th)
ERNEST JEROME HOPKINS, *speaks on:*
"OUR LAWLESS POLICE"

DEBATE!
RESOLVED: THAT THE WORKERS TRIUMPH CANNOT BE ACHIEVED THRU DEMOCRACY.
December 13th, Sunday, 8:30 p.m.
HEYWOOD BROUN vs. **MICHAEL GOLD**
B'KLYN FORUM—B'KLYN ACADEMY OF MUSIC
30 Lafayette Avenue near Flatbush Ave.
Tickets still available: 25c, 50c, $1.00, at Box Office—Rand Book Store, 7 East 15th St., N.Y.C.—New Masses, 63 West 15th Street, N. Y. C.

SYMPOSIUM
on the
"HOLLYWOOD AND SOVIET CINEMA"
SPEAKERS
H. W. L. DANA, Critic and Lecturer
MICHAEL GOLD, Author of: "Jews Without Money," etc.
H. A. POTAMKIN, Noted Cinema Critic
WALDO FRANK, Novelist and Critic
Chairman: SAMUEL ORNITZ
Author of: "Haunch, Paunch and Jowl," etc.
Also Showing of Several Sovkino Films
SUNDAY—DECEMBER 6th, at 8 P. M.
at the NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH 66 W. 12th St.
Tickets: $1.00—for sale at: New School for Social Research, 66 W. 12th St.

LECTURE
DEC. 6th SUNDAY 8:30 p.m.
"THE WORLD TOMORROW"
By PROF. VLADIMIR KARAPETOFF
of Cornell University
B'KLYN FORUM—B'KLYN ACADEMY OF MUSIC
30 LAFAYETTE AVENUE, Near FLATBUSH
Tickets: 25c, 50c, $1.00 at Box Office—Rand Book Store 7 E. 15th St., N. Y. C. Prof. KARAPETOFF will render a few selections on the piano after the lecture.

When writing to advertisers please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evans gives a striking performance as Florence Nightingale in "The Lady with a Lamp" (Maxine Elliott's Theater), but the play, for all its obvious sincerity and its impressive moments, never succeeds entirely in escaping the curse which rests upon the all-too-improving chronicle. It is pedestrian and matter-of-fact. On the other hand, the sentimental farce "A Widow in Green" (Cort Theater), pleased me a great deal. There is a delightful performance by Claiborne Foster and there is a satiric edge which, so far as I am concerned, made the surface sentiment not only tolerable but pleasing.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Films

Beginnings

"THE CHAMP" (Astor Theater) is interesting for a significant reason. It is pure movie. "The Champ" is neither a done-over book nor a photographed play. And this is not to say simply that the scenario was written directly for the movies. The story, in fact, is the least important as it is certainly the least distinguished part of the production. It is the excellent quality of the settings, the acting, and the directing which sets it apart as a moving picture.

To begin with the settings. It is a commonplace that the films have the distinction and the advantage, compared with the stage play or novel, of being presented through the medium of a camera which is unlimited by either time or space. The present play, in which much of the action takes place on the racetrack and in the prize ring, profits from that advantage. But the scene which sets the tone of the film is the room "over the Greek's" in which the boy Dink and his father the ex-champion live. And this room differs from any possible stage or written setting for reasons having much more to do with art than with anything so mechanical as a movable camera. This room, in fact, with its brass bed and the limp white curtain which, when Dink opens the window, seems to be swayed more by the blaring tunes from the Greek's nickel piano than by anything so fresh as a breeze, has the power and the drab poignancy of the best of those proletarian interiors which so many of our contemporary artists have painted—with this difference, that it is much more alive. Yet it is not a photograph, either. Photography here is the means, as words or paints are means, of creating reality, but reality which has been distilled by a process of the mind that makes it art.

The acting as mere acting can best be described by saying that Jackie Cooper and Wallace Beery are at their best. The story, as I have indicated, is poor stuff. It tells of a boy, Dink, who adores his father, an ex-champion. The action revolves about the attempt of the father to "come back" in the ring, for the sake of the boy, against great obstacles of drink and cards. He does come back only to die of heart failure when the fight is over. But even such trash as this comes to life because Jackie Cooper, irrespective of age, is one of the best actors on the screen. He proves it in the last scene in which he is called upon to show uncontrollable grief. Here is a scene which ordinarily would be painfully humiliating to the sensitive spectator. Jackie Cooper makes it authentic and moving; and the director, by a sound psychological stroke in sending the boy to the arms of his mother, gives the picture an inevitable ending. But again, the important thing in relation to my thesis is that the acting is possible only to the screen. The dialogue heightens and makes articulate effects already achieved by facial expression, motions, and tones which would be quite lost in a stage play beyond the fifth row and not capable of sufficiently minute and swift description in any written form.

It is difficult, naturally, to isolate direction from acting and setting. It can be said, however, that King Vidor oversteps himself only two or three times in the picture's avowed intention of wringing hearts. But it is this avowal, of course, which indicates why "The Champ" is a promise and not an achievement. There is intelligence in its separate parts—the acting, the settings, the direction. The production as a whole has not passed through that process of the mind before referred to which might make it important as a work of art. As for the story itself, it is entirely without intellectual content or implication. It is, in fact, merely a reproduction of emotion reduced to its lowest democratic denominator. It brings tears, but the tears mean nothing except to the box office.

Perhaps we are seeing, after all, the beginnings of art. Perhaps the films as they are at present, in all their extravagant and unmotivated sentimentality and extraordinary mechanical perfection, presage the mass art, mass produced, of the machine age. Certainly the improvement in the average film since the invention of the talkies seems to warrant hope.

"Strictly Dishonorable" is an entertaining, uncensored, not-quite-so-well-done reproduction of the stage play. As such, it has very little significance as a motion picture. It will be amusing to those who did not see the legitimate version. But the play does not bear up under a second witnessing.

Douglas Fairbanks in "Around the World in 80 Minutes" does what we have always wished the movies would do much oftener. His tour suffers greatly, however, from too many ruins, palaces, and other "sights," and not nearly enough ordinary street life. The Laurel and Hardy comedy which happened to be on the same program was the more important feature. These two are among our most precious fools.

MARGARET MARSHALL

☐ WITHIN THE FORTNIGHT ☐

PLAYS TO SEE

Bloody Laughter—49 St.—W. of B'way.
Brief Moment—Belasco—W. 44 St.
Civic Light Opera Co.—Erlanger—W. 44 St.
Counsellor-at-Law—Plymouth—W. 45 St.
Cynara—Morosco—45 St. W. of B'way
Grand Hotel—National—W. 41 St.
Hamlet—Broadhurst—W. 44 St
Louder, Please—Masque—45 St. W. of B'way.
Miss Gulliver Travels—Hudson—W. 44 St.
Mourning Becomes Electra—Guild—52 St. W. of B'way.
Reunion in Vienna—Martin Beck—45 St. & 8 Ave.
Sing High, Sing Low—Sam H. Harris—42 St. W. of B'way.
Cornelia Otis Skinner—Avon—W. 45 St.
Streets of New York—48 St.—E. of B'way.
The Barretts of Wimpole Street—Empire—B'way. & 40 St.
The Band Wagon—New Amsterdam—W. 42 St.
The Cat and The Fiddle—Globe—B'way & 46 St.
The Good Fairy—Henry Miller's—124 W. 43 St.
The Left Bank—Little—44 St.
The Laugh Parade—Imperial—45 St. W. of B'way.

☐ FILMS ☐

NOW PLAYING!
THRILLING GERMAN HUNGARIAN FILM OPERETTA
with scenes laid in beautiful Munchen
"SEIN LIEBESLIED" (His Love Song)
with Paul Vincenti and Ernest Verebes — famous Hungarian stars
Directed by Geza von Bolvary, who is responsible for
"Zwei Herzen im ¾ Takt"
EUROPA 154 West 55th Street Just East of 7th Ave. Circle 7-0129
Continuous Noon to Midnight Popular Prices

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED